

VOLUME 17

NUMBER 1

PRICE 8p

LEVEL
ONE



Christian Order

Summary of Contents for January 1976

THE ISSUE OF DOWNHAM MARKET

Fr. Bryan Houghton

ABUSE OF ECCLESIASTICAL POWER

Michael Davies

UNWORTHY SHEPHERD

Fr. Werenfried Van Straaten

THE END OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

John Tracy, S.J.

INFLATION: 2

J. M. Jackson

January Renewers

Would you please be so kind as to make every effort to renew by return of post, if at all possible, on your first reminder. December renewers did this and, already, it has made a very considerable and favourable difference to the finances of *Christian Order*. You will see very easily what I mean if I point out that those who wait for a second reminder before renewing their subscriptions, put me to an added expense of 13p in each case. This means, in fact, that their subscriptions run at a loss. Please help me avoid this loss with a very prompt renewal. Thank you so much for this kindness that you will do me and for all your most loyal support. My best wishes to all readers for every blessing during this New Year.

Paul Crane, S.J.

Contents

Page

- 2 THE MASS:
A SUGGESTION
The Editor
- 4 ABUSE OF ECCLESIASTICAL
POWER
Michael Davies
- 9 THE ISSUE OF
DOWNHAM MARKET
Father Bryan Houghton
- 20 1: THE STORY OF
MARGARET GIGGS
Philip Caraman, S.J.
- 23 CURRENT COMMENT
The Editor
- 34 UNWORTHY SHEPHERD
Fr. Werenfried Van Straaten
- 37 THE END OF CHRISTIAN
EDUCATION?
John Tracy, S.J.
- 49 INFLATION: THE
FUNDAMENTAL CAUSES (2)
J. M. Jackson
- 56 BOOK REVIEW

If You Change Your Address:
Please let us know two or
three weeks ahead if possible
and please send us both new
and old addresses. Thank you.

Christian Order is a
monthly magazine devoted
to the promulgation of
Catholic Social Teaching and
incisive comment on current
affairs in Church and State;
at home and abroad; in the
political, social and in-
dustrial fields.

It is published by Father
Paul Crane, S.J., from 65,
Belgrave Rd., London,
S.W.1. This is the sole postal
address to which all com-
munications concerning
Christian Order should be
sent.

Christian Order is ob-
tainable only by subscription
and from this address. In the
case of those desiring more
than one copy, these are
obtainable at the sub-
scription rate and should be
paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to
Christian Order is £1 in the
United Kingdom and
Republic of Ireland; \$3.00 in
the United States, Canada
and Australia; elsewhere,
according to the ap-
proximate sterling rate of
exchange, in the currency of
the country concerned or
any convenient currency.

Air-mail rates as follows:
U.S.A., Canada

India, etc. — £4.00, U.S.
\$8.00

Australia — £4.50, A. \$8.00

N. Zealand — £4.50, N.Z.
\$8.00.

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 17

JANUARY, 1976

NUMBER 1

The Mass: a Suggestion

THE EDITOR

I WAS impressed and, indeed, moved to read in the *Catholic Herald* some weeks before Christmas a letter from a Catholic undergraduate suggesting that those who wished to worship God in the traditional manner of the Catholic Church, particularly in the form of the Tridentine Mass, should be given opportunity to do so. If this were done, the writer claimed, many now suffering so grievously from the loss of the old liturgy would come in from the cold and feel at home, once again, in their own Church. The gains all round would be inestimable in terms of unity. Moreover, as time went by, a great many questions, now in hot dispute, would be settled. If, for example, the New Mass proved to be in fact all it is made out to be by its supporters at present, it would keep its congregations and the Old would die out as its few ageing adherents went over the years to their reward. If the reverse turned out to be true, then the Old Mass would regain its congregations, the New would go to the sidelines and the argument of those who have said all along that the New Mass was not wanted by the Faithful, would be vindicated once and for all.

Some, of course, would argue, as Father Bryan Houghton does with great clarity in this issue, that this is what was originally intended; the New Mass was *authorized* indeed, but never meant to *supplant* the Old. This I believe personally to be the true position; but I have no desire to argue it

here. All I want to do is to suggest that the argument could be laid effectively to rest and the hurt endured by so many healed if the simple and sensible point made by that Catholic undergraduate in his letter were taken up by the Bishops and given concrete expression; if the Old Mass, in other words, were allowed to run its course alongside the New; just that and nothing more.

Enough, I would suggest, has been seen this past year to make a step in this direction a matter of urgency. Signs are not wanting of a great and growing desire in the hearts of many for the return of the Old Mass. For the English are a stubborn lot; after a period of confusion, which has puzzled and now irritates them, many of them want, as never before, the certainty and stability, the link with the past that the Old Mass gave them. They find little rest in the New. The surety of the Old has gone and they are left, as it seems, with a new manufactured product, which is not and never will be the same in the eyes of so many of them. It is as if their Queen's crown were made now of plastic or the great Sword of State of burnished tin.

There is also a darker side. Some Catholics are now dreadfully scarred; staying away from Church, unable, psychologically and physically, to bear what they think of as the new protestanized thing. I know of one with martyrs' blood in his veins, proud of his heritage, who can no longer bring himself to go. We shrug these off at our peril. Their cases are real and there are far more of them, perhaps, than priests or bishops realise. Others, meanwhile, are reaching cracking-point; good and wonderful Catholics beginning to do what only a few years ago they could never in this world have seen themselves doing — turning away in tears from the Church they love because they feel they have no place there; they can no longer bear what goes on inside; they no longer belong. The number of these is increasing. Broken-hearted, with tears in their eyes, they are opting out. Should they not be given a chance to return?

And so, at the beginning of this New Year, I make this plea that the Old Mass should be allowed to run alongside the New, without argument or fuss, in peace and quiet; so that, seeing this, the broken-hearted may return, their tears dried; the Church once again what they always thought it to be until recent tragic days — their Mother.

Space forbade this short article following on as an Appendix to last month's article on Bishop Grosseteste. It is published here by way of completion.

Abuse of Ecclesiastical Power

MICHAEL DAVIES

ACCORDING to Catholic theologians and canon lawyers, a prelate can abuse his position in a number of ways, which include the imposition of unjust laws or failure to guard and transmit the deposit of Faith, either by remaining silent in the face of heresy or even by teaching heresy himself. A Catholic has the right to refuse obedience in the first case and the duty of opposing the prelate in the second. Their consensus regarding law in general would appear to be that the legislator should not simply refrain from demanding something that his subjects would find impossible to carry out, but that laws should not be too difficult or distressing for those subjected to them. St. Thomas explains that, for a law to be just, it must conform to the demands of reason and have an effect which is both good and for the benefit of those for whom it is intended. A law can cease to bind without revocation on the part of the legislator when it is clearly harmful, impossible, or irrational. This is particularly true if a prelate commands anything contrary to divine precept. (*Praelato non est obediendum contra praeceptum divinum.*) In support of this teaching he cites Acts 5:29: "We ought to obey God rather than men". He teaches that not only would the prelate err in giving such an order but that anyone obeying him would sin just as certainly as if he disobeyed a divine command. ("... ipse peccaret praecipiens, et ei obediens, quasi contra praeceptum Domini agens . . .")⁽¹⁾

St. Paul's rebuke to St. Peter at Antioch (Galatians, 2)

proves that occasions can occur when the Pope himself needs to be corrected. Peter's behaviour in not eating with the Gentile converts was not in conformity with his own convictions or the truth of the Gospel. He was also endangering both the liberty of the Gentiles and the Jews from the Mosaic Law and, although not guilty of doctrinal error, was, at the least, exerting moral pressure on behalf of the Judaizers.⁽²⁾ St. Thomas comments: "If the Faith be in imminent peril, prelates ought to be accused by their subjects, even in public. Thus, St. Paul, who was the subject of St. Peter, called him to task in public because of the impending danger of scandal concerning a point of Faith. As the Glossary to St. Augustine puts it: 'St. Peter himself set an example for those who rule, to the effect that if they ever stray from the straight path they are not to feel that anyone is unworthy of correcting them, even if such a person be one of their subjects' ".⁽³⁾

Suarez, an eminent Jesuit theologian of the sixteenth century, states: "If (the Pope) lays down an order contrary to right customs one does not have to obey him; if he tries to do something manifestly opposed to justice and to the common good, it would be licit to resist him; if he attacks by force, he could be repelled by force, with the moderation characteristic of a good defence".⁽⁴⁾ Vitoria, his Dominican counterpart, writes: "If the Pope by his orders and his acts destroys the Church, one can resist him and impede the execution of his commands".⁽⁵⁾

Saint Robert Bellarmine considers that "just as it is licit to resist the Pontiff who attacks the body, so also is it licit to resist him who attacks souls or destroys the civil order, or above all tries to destroy the Church. I say that it is licit to resist him by not doing what he orders and by impeding the execution of his will; it is not licit, however, to judge him, to punish him, or depose him, for these are acts proper to a superior".⁽⁶⁾ This would apply even to a heretical Pope who can be resisted but not deposed, as Cardinal Journet, one of the greatest of modern theologians, points out: "For no one on earth can touch the Pope".

In his *Summa de Ecclesia* (lib. II, cap.cvi), Cardinal Turrecremata points out several remedies for such a calamity: respectful admonitions, direct resistance to bad acts, and so forth. All these could, of course, prove useless:

"There remains a supreme resource, never useless, terrible sometimes as death, as secret as love. This is prayer, the resource of the saints. 'See that I do not have to complain of you to Jesus crucified', wrote Catherine of Sienna to Pope Gregory XI: 'there is none other to whom I can appeal since you have no superiors on earth' ".⁽⁷⁾

Writing in *The Tablet* in 1965, Abbot (now Bishop) B. C. Butler posed the question as to the source of authority in the Church "if the Pope has disenfranchised himself by public heresy? Where at such a time is hierarchical authority? Where is the authority that can, not indeed depose a Pope (no human authority can depose a Pope), but declare that the *soi-disant* Pope has lost his powers, whether by heresy, schism, or lunacy"?⁽⁸⁾ Volume III of *A Catholic Dictionary of Theology*, currently appearing under the auspices of the English and Welsh Hierarchy, was published in 1971. Under the entry "Infallibility of the Pope", detailed treatment is given to the question of popes who have erred, such as Honorious or Liberius, and to the theoretical question of a heretical pope.⁽⁹⁾ There is an interesting reference to Cajetan, one of the greatest theologians since Aquinas, who "in preparation for the decision of Lateran V (Denzinger, 740) on the relation of Pope to Council has written two small works in 1511-12. Cajetan holds that a Pope can fall into heresy (as a private doctor) that he does not then automatically cease to be Pope, as some canonists said, but that he is, by the divine precept that is communicated in Tit. 3:10, to be avoided after a first and second rebuke, yet he is, even so, not to be deposed by men. Rather they should pray to God unitedly for him to be taken away".⁽¹⁰⁾ An obvious example of a pope teaching heresy as a private doctor is that of Pope John XXII, who taught that there was no particular judgement; that the souls of the just do not enjoy the beatific vision immediately; that the wicked are not at once eternally damned; and that all await the judgement of God on the Last Day. The Pope was denounced as a heretic by some Franciscans and then appointed a commission of theologians to examine the question. The commission found that the Pope was in error and he made a public recantation.⁽¹¹⁾

Where a matter of faith is involved resistance is not a right, but an obligation for the faithful Catholic and the only correct course of action is that taken by Eusebius and so

highly praised by Dom Gueranger in his *Liturgical Year*: "On Christmas Day, 428, Nestorius (Patriarch of Constantinople), profiting from the immense crowd assembled to celebrate the birth of the Divine Child to Our Lady uttered this blasphemy from his episcopal throne: 'Mary did not give birth to God; her son was only a man, the instrument of God'.

"At these words a tremor of horror passed through the multitude. The general indignation was voiced by Eusebius, a layman, who stood up in the crowd and protested. Soon a more detailed protest was drafted in the name of the members of the abandoned Church, and numerous copies spread far and wide, declaring anathema on whoever should dare to say that He who was born of the Virgin Mary was other than the only begotten Son of God. This attitude not only safeguarded the Faith of the Eastern Church, but was praised alike by Popes and Councils. When the shepherd turns into a wolf the first duty of the flock is to defend itself. As a general rule, doctrine comes from the bishops to the faithful, and it is not for the faithful, who are subjects in the order of Faith, to pass judgement on their superiors. But every Christian, by virtue of his title to the name Christian, has not only the necessary knowledge of the essentials of the treasure of Revelation, but also the duty of safeguarding them. The principle is the same, whether it is a matter of belief or conduct, that is of dogma or morals. Treachery such as that of Nestorius is rare in the Church; but it can happen that, for one reason or another, pastors remain silent on essential matters of faith."

Dom Gueranger then insists that, when the Faith is compromised by someone in authority in the Church, the true Christian is the one who makes a stand for the truth rather than the one who does nothing under the specious pretext of submission to lawful authority.

To sum up what has been written here, normally subjects must be obedient to lawful authority in Church and State but they have the right to resist harsh and harmful laws which do not contribute to the common good. They must never compromise the Faith under the pretext of obedience. "When the shepherd becomes a wolf the flock must defend itself". Where the Pope is concerned, no steps can be taken beyond respectful admonitions and a refusal to obey wrong or unjust commands, but such a refusal could only be

justified under the most exceptional circumstances, when the fact that the subject was right and the Pope wrong was not just probable but manifest. In the case of Bishop Robert Grosseteste there can be no reasonable doubt but that he was right and Pope Innocent IV wrong. What has happened once can always happen again and we can say with the saintly English Bishop and in perfect loyalty to the Holy See: "God forbid that to any who are truly united to Christ, not willing in any way to go against His will, this See and those who preside in it should be a cause of falling away or apparent schism, by commanding such men to do what is opposed to Christ's will".

NOTES:

- 1 ST, II-II, Q.XXXIII, Art.VII, ad.5.
- 2 A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture (London, 1953), p.1116.
- 3 ST, II-II, Q.XXXIII, Art. IV, ad.2.
- 4 De Fide, disp.X, sect VI, n.16.
- 5 Obras de Francisco de Vitoria, pp.486-7.
- 6 De. Rom. Pont., Lib. II, c.29.
- 7 The Church of the Word Incarnate, vol. I, p.425.
- 8 The Tablet, 11 September, 1965, p.996.
- 9 See also The Remnant; 5 May 1975, p.2, for more details regarding Popes Honorius and Liberius.
- 10 A Catholic Dictionary of Theology, Vol. III, (London, 1971), p.116.
- 11 E. John. The Popes (London, 1964), p.253.

A very full treatment of the questions raised in this appendix is found in the *Courrier de Rome*, No. 15 of 15 September 1967 in an article by Fr. Raymond Dulac to which full acknowledgement is given.

As I await the gift of sleep
Dear Lord

Let me not take for granted
The roof above and the pillow below
my head.

Arouse my sluggish compassion
for the homeless and the destitute
and for all Christians suffering
for their faith.

Sir Arnold Lunn

This article is not written to prolong needless controversy but to bring out the real issue which lies behind the differences between Father Baker and his Bishop. As such it goes far beyond the bounds of the Downham Market dispute and covers with great clarity the nodal point in current controversy concerning the Tridentine Mass. The article is of vital importance. We commend it very sincerely to our readers.

The Issue of Downham Market

FATHER BRYAN HOUGHTON

NOT only am I a priest of the diocese of Northampton but I have known its bishop, Charles Grant, for some forty years. We were at the Beda together before the war, when he was studying Canon Law at the Gregorian University and I was a clerical larva waiting to emerge as a priest. Some ten years later, the present incumbent of Downham Market, Oswald Baker, became my curate at St. Anthony's, Slough. Thus are known to me (and fairly intimately) both the protagonists in the tragic battle of Downham.

His Lordship, of course, has not consulted me; why should he? Father Baker, however, has sent me several dispatches from the front, including a copy of His Lordship's letter asking him to resign his parish. This letter seems to me to be of considerable public interest for two reasons: firstly, it draws attention in a concrete case to the state of legislation in regard to the liturgy; secondly, it reveals the reactions of a perfectly honourable bishop. I shall consequently analyse this letter as objectively as I can and with what care space allows.

His Lordship asks Fr Baker to resign the parish of

Downham Market on the sole ground that he continues to celebrate Mass exclusively according to the old rite, which His Lordship considers to be illicit. In support of this contention as to the illegality of the old rite, His Lordship quite rightly appeals to the *Constitutio* of the new Roman Missal which is, indeed, the only legislative as opposed to administrative document on the subject.

Before examining the text from the *Constitutio* quoted by His Lordship, I should like to make three remarks:

- a. The *Constitutio* is written in particularly clear, unambiguous Latin.
- b. Unfortunately, the translations have been poor to the point of being erroneous. I have myself seen "*quiddam nunc cogere et efficere placet*" rendered as "we now wish to give the force of law" etc. . . .
- c. His Lordship's translation is not taken from the *Editio Typica* as published in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* and in the front of all new Missals, but from the first edition, later corrected by the addition of the "dating clause" (see below). Moreover, the evidence seems to me indubitable that His Lordship has not translated direct from the Latin, but from the French of the highly tendentious little book, *La Messe, de S. Pie V a Paul VI* by Dom Guy Oury of Solesmes.

I shall return to His Lordship's translation in due course. What is wanted in the meantime is a word-for-word translation, from the Latin of the *Acta*, of the passage from the *Constitutio* quoted by His Lordship. This I shall give for each sentence as I proceed.

THE CONSTITUTIO

I. The first sentence of the *Constitutio* quoted by His Lordship reads in the Latin: "*Ad extremum, ex iis quae hactenus de novo Missali Romano exposuimus quiddam nunc cogere et efficere placet*". What trouble it has given to the translators! The official French version still reads: "*Pour terminer, nous voulons donner force de loi á tout ce que nous avons exposé . . .*" The official English version follows suit: "*We wish to give the force of law etc . . .*" Dom Guy Oury is more circumspect and has: "*. . . il nous plaít d'en déduire et d'en tirer au clair un point particulier.*" His Lordship follows

Dom Guy: "In conclusion We wish to lay stress on one particular thought arising from the various things We have been explaining about the new Roman Missal." There is already a wide margin between "force of law" and "particular stress". What can these enigmatic words "*quiddam cogere et efficere*" possibly mean?

They are perfectly straight forward. *Quiddam cogere* breaks down into *agere quiddam con* = to work something together, that is, in the present context, to sum up. *Quiddam efficere* breaks down into *facere quiddam ex* = to make something out, that is, in the present context, to draw a conclusion. The sentence therefore means: "Lastly, from what we have so far declared concerning the new Roman Missal, We should now like to sum up and draw a conclusion". That is what the Latin means and only prejudice can colour it.

So the legislator is now going to sum up and draw his conclusion. We feel we know exactly what to expect, so carefully was it all done in the Bull *Quo Primum* of St. Pius V. In the first place, the said Bull *Quo Primum* will be abrogated by Pope Paul along with its indult and its exceptions in favour of rites over 200 years old; then the new Missal will be promulgated with a date for its introduction; there will be a clause excluding other rites with the dates at which they become illicit; certain powers may be delegated to local hierarchies; exceptions may be made. There is bound to be a word of pastoral solicitude for the millions of faithful who will be losing the Mass they love. Finally, a "clause de style" and "*Datum Romae . . .*" Full stop. The painful process will be over.

II. Not a bit of it! This is precisely what we do not get. The legislator Pope Paul, proceeds to sum up by referring back to his opening passage concerning the Missal of St. Pius V. His Lordship's translation is unexceptionable and requires no comment: "When Our predecessor St. Pius V published the first edition of the *Missale Romanum* he presented it to the Christian people both as an instrument of liturgical unity and as a witness to the truth and devotion of the Church's worship". Exactly.

III. We now come to a long passage running in one sentence to the end of the paragraph. Word-for-word it reads: "Ourself no differently; even though by decree of Council

Vatican II We have admitted 'legitimate variations and adaptations', We nonetheless still trust it to come about that this same Missal will be accepted by the Christian faithful as an aid to witnessing to and strengthening the mutual unity of all, in as much as by its assistance one and the same prayer, more fragrant than incense, shall ascend from all people in a vast variety of languages to the heavenly Father through our High Priest Jesus Christ in the Holy Spirit".

It is extraordinary, but there it is: no abrogation, no exclusions, no prohibitions, no delegations, no pastoral compassion. The operative words are: "Haud secus Nos, etsi varietates ascivimus, nihilo tamen secius fore confidimus ut hoc ipsum accipiat" "Ourself no differently, even though We have admitted variations, We nonetheless still trust it to come about that this same Missal will be accepted" It is perhaps impossible to render in English the diffidence of the Latin.

Such is the legislator's summing up and conclusion. One must take it as it stands. I submit, moreover, that the legislator's intention is perfectly clear: as at the first Reformation Pius V had codified the Roman Missal, so Paul VI in his new Missal is attempting to canalize the new Reformation. The two Missals are mutually complementary, not mutually exclusive. Seen in this light, the *Constitutio* appears as the expression of a brave and noble endeavour. Seen as the instrument with which to wipe out the Immemorial Mass, the *Constitutio* appears as a strangely hypocritical, ambiguous and vindictive document.

III A. I should like to say a word about pastoral compassion. According to Bishop Grant, Pope Paul VI in his *Constitutio* is about to suppress the Mass which all Latin Catholics have attended for a millenium and a half. Whatever the Church has to show, from St Peter's, Rome to the missionary's shack, from high works of art to the humble lavabo-cloth, our schools, our hospitals, the lot, were provided largely from collections taken at that Mass. Not only are the living Catholics to be deprived of it but, far more painful, so are their children and their children's children, forever and without hope. Is it too much to expect a word of compassion? We know what compassion the same legislator expressed for sinners in *Humanae Vitae*. Has he none for the devout? His Lordship certainly does not realize it but, on his reading of

the *Constitutio*. Pope Paul VI is the insensitive robot of a horror film. On my reading, the Pope is restored to the realm of humanity and sanity: he had no reason to express compassion because he neither intended to nor did deprive anybody of anything. What he did do was to beg for unity. This he has not got because unity does not come about by excluding an essential part of the whole — Pius V's codification of the *Immemorial Mass*.

IV. Let us return to the text. We now come to a clause which His Lordship fails to translate. This has arisen not from any sinister motive on his part, but because he is translating from a history book which quotes the first edition, instead of from the *Editio Typica* of the *Acta*. The incident merely goes to show the chaos of post-conciliar legislation; not only are the translations loaded, but there is tampering with the text of the laws themselves. Dear me! Is nothing straight and above board in these post-conciliar days?

Curiously enough, at first sight the missing clause is the most essential to His Lordship's argument. It reads: "*Quae Constitutione hac Nostra praescripsimus vigere incipient a XXX proximi mensis Novembris hoc anno, id est a Dominica I Adventus.*" "What We have ordered by this Our *Constitutio* will begin to take effect as from next November 30th, that is the first Sunday of Advent" (1969). That is all.

There are three points worth making about this insertion:

a) the insertion is the only sentence in the whole document which has a strictly legal form and the word *Constitutio* is to be found only in it, apart from in the title; otherwise the document reads like an explanatory introduction.

b) Without the insertion the document would become a pure permission, not a law, since its implementation would be left *sine die*, without a date.

c) With the insertion there is a properly dated law all right — doubtless the reason for inserting it — but the law covers only "what We have ordered by this Our *Constitutio*". There is no mention of it being obligatory. No date is given for the supposed suppression of the old rite, which might be the same day or ten years later. Had suppression been intended, one would have expected the clause to continue along the following lines: "It is left to National Episcopal Conferences to decide for the areas under their jurisdiction and ac-

cording to pastoral requirements the date when Our new Missal shall become compulsory and the use of that Our Predecessor St Pius V illicit, provided that recourse should be had to this Apostolic See if the date exceeds five years from that of Our present promulgation." Something of that sort. But in fact there is nothing because the new Missal is not compulsory and the old not illicit.

At this point it is important to remember that once this date of implementation has been given any additional clauses are comments on what has been promulgated; they neither do nor can alter the law. According to the *Constitutio* as it stands at this juncture, three types of Masses are licit in the Latin Rite:

1. those in existence before 1370, e.g. the Ambrosian, Toledan, Carthusian etc. . . ;
2. the old Roman rite as codified by Pius V;
3. the new liturgy as canalized by Paul VI.

V. We now come to the final clause. Word-for-word it reads: "We wish, moreover, that these decisions and ordinances of Ours should be stable and effective now and in future, notwithstanding — in so far as may be necessary — Constitutions and Apostolic Regulations published by Our Predecessors and all other ordinances, even those deserving special mention and exceptional treatment". I underline in so far as may be necessary (*quatenus opus sit*) because it shows quite clearly that the passage is a "clause de style" and because, unfortunately, it is missing from His Lordship's translation.

Anyway, nobody can possibly construe the clause as suppressing the old rite, not merely because it comes after the dating clause but because it is certainly not the old rite which could prevent or has prevented "these decisions and ordinances of Ours from being stable and effective now and in future". Indeed, how pathetically those words read, *firma et efficacia esse et fore*, so soon after they were written. Neither does the fault lie with Father Baker.

Much more could be said about the *Constitutio* but it would be unbearably tedious. Before taking leave of it, however, I should like to make one further point. It is those who hold that it does not suppress the old rite who also maintain that the *Constitutio* is quite unambiguous: it says

what it means and means what it says. It is those who, like His Lordship, hold that it does suppress the old rite who are obliged to regard it as ambiguous: it fails to say what it means. But, if this is so, then the *Constitutio* does not bind at all, since "*lex dubia non obligat*".

ADMINISTRATION

So far so good. I think that to any unprejudiced mind two points have been established:

1. the new Missal has been promulgated, albeit by an insertion in the *Acta*, and became licit on November 30th, 1969;
2. the old Missal has not been suppressed and remains licit after November 30th, 1969.

But as far as Father Baker is concerned, I do not think that it carries him quite the whole way. He is a priest ordained "for the service of the diocese" and has cure of souls at Downham Market under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Northampton. Moreover, it must be borne in mind that, within his own diocese, the administrative ordinances of the bishop are valid and binding in so far as they are "within the scope of the law", even though his motives for making such ordinances may be misconceived and based on erroneous appreciation of law or fact.

VI. We have now left the legislative sphere and enter the administrative, within His Lordship's jurisdiction. His Lordship writes: "Episcopal Conferences were later allowed to postpone the date when the New Order of Mass was to come into force so that time would be given for vernacular translations to be prepared. The Bishops' Conference of England and Wales subsequently decreed that the date for this country should be the First Sunday of Lent, 1970". This particular muddle occurred because, as I have already pointed out in section IV, the *Constitutio* gave no date for the supposed suppression of the old rite. It is proof in practice that the law is inoperable, if it is taken to imply this suppression, without administrative acts of doubtful legality.

Moreover, His Lordship is not expressing himself accurately. The New Order became licit, albeit in Latin, owing to the absence of approved translations, on November 30th,

1969, as the *Constitutio* had decreed. What happened on the First Sunday of Lent, 1970, was something quite different. On that date the hierarchy of England and Wales claimed, erroneously but in good faith, to make the New Order compulsory and thereby to suppress the old rite.

In passing, I should like to stress the hierarchy's good faith. One must try to recall the atmosphere in 1969. Every means of propaganda had drummed into our heads that a New Mass was on the way which would supplant the Old. We all believed it, friend and foe alike. When the New Ordo was published we took it for granted that it did what we had expected it to do. It is a case of mass hallucination. Moreover, everyone started to examine the *Instructiones Generales* and the New Missal itself, either under a microscope or through pink glasses, but nobody ever bothered to cast an eye on the *Constitutio*: we all knew the sort of stuff it would contain. Even now, over six years later, I wonder how many bishops have read it carefully in the original Latin? The same applies to the erroneous translations; they were not made in bad faith: the translator jotted down what prejudice told him that the *Constitutio* must mean.

To return to the above-mentioned muddle and error, would they render invalid the order of the Bishop of Northampton to celebrate according to the New Ordo throughout his diocese after the First Sunday of Lent, 1970? (I neglect Episcopal Conferences as they lack legal status.) No, not entirely, but only in so far as his order is *ultra vires legis*, outside the scope of the law. The claim to impose the exclusive use of the new rite on all his subjects is certainly *ultra vires*; but to require that the new rite be available to all his subjects is equally certainly within the scope of the law.

Does this mean that Father Baker should make the new rite available at Downham Market? *All things being equal*, yes. True, he could not be forced to use the new rite himself but there would be nothing against his exchanging altars, say once a month of a Sunday evening, with a neighbour who uses the new rite properly. Thus would the new rite be as available at Downham as the old would be in the neighbouring parish. Indeed, it seems to me that the judicious use of exchanging altars might solve the existing liturgical impasse. Change would come about gradually, nobody knowing

quite how or why, and, above all, without anybody losing too much face.

I have underlined "all things being equal" in the above paragraph because at the moment they are not. The new rite is doubtless available to the parishoners of Downham at every surrounding parish; they can attend it at no great inconvenience. Not so those of His Lordship's subjects who wish to attend the old rite; for miles they have nowhere to go apart from Downham Market. Thus I rather doubt if, at this particular moment of time, Father Baker is in conscience bound to provide the new rite at Downham, although as a gesture I think it desirable. However, if His Lordship were to implement the *Constitutio* and provide reasonable facilities for his subjects to attend the old rite, then I think that Fr Baker would be under an obligation to make the new rite available in his parish.

VII. His Lordship's second quotation is from the Bishops' Conference of April 24th, 1975, giving as the only exceptions to the obligatory use of the new rite "old and sick priests . . . privately" and the beneficiaries of Cardinal Heenan's Indult. This can be said straight away to be *ultra vires*. The restrictions, including those to the Cardinal's Indult, have no more authority than the Sacred Congregation for the Liturgy, which is an administrative, not a legislative body. This fact is indirectly recognized by Bishop Grant himself, since he fails to appeal to the totally damning *Notificatio* from that body dated October 28th, 1974, in which it is stated that the new rite is obligatory "notwithstanding any custom whatsoever, even immemorial".

VIII. His Lordship sums up in the following paragraph:
"You told me on the telephone that you are unable in conscience to celebrate Mass in any way other than in the old rite. You have continued to use the old rite in your parochial Masses, and on Saturday the 30th of August you celebrated Mass in the old rite as part of a demonstration. This conduct is in open disobedience to the law of the Church as laid down in the above mentioned Constitution, and is known as such to your parishoners. This is a state of affairs which, in conscience, I am unable to allow to continue, since I consider it seriously harmful to your ministry as Parish Priest."

I think the following comments worth making:

1. Fr Baker is said to be "unable in conscience to celebrate Mass in any other way than the old rite". Here he is caretainly within his right, not merely "in conscience" — ever a doubtful instrument — but according to the *Constitutio*. His Lordship, of course, is also within his right to demand that his subjects at Downham should be familiar with the new rite. But I have already dealt with this matter in the last two paragraphs of section VI.

2. As for the demonstration on August 30th, it cannot be adduced in evidence since, long before that date, His Lordship's Auxiliary, Bishop Clark, had already asked Father Baker to resign.

3. "This is a state of affairs which, in conscience, I am unable to allow to continue". This looks like tit-for-tat to Fr Baker's "conscience" over the old rite. What is at issue, however, is neither of their consciences but the meaning of the *Constitutio*.

What a tragic affair it all is!

However, under God's Divine Providence it may still be the occasion for bringing to the Church in England that unity so ardently desired by the Pope. Only, to do so, the protagonists will have to examine their consciences rather less than the law and, what may require heroism, be less anxious to save their faces than to save the truth.

ADDITIONAL NOTE

on the insertion in the text of the *Acta*: "*Quae Constitutione hac Nostra praescripsimus . . .*"

In spite of being so brief the insertion is the only piece of bad Latin which I have noticed in the whole text of the *Constitutio*. No criticism would be possible if it read: "*Quae de Constitutione hac Nostra praescripsimus*"; but then it would mean "What we have written above concerning this Our Constitution". One cannot help wondering if this was not the text submitted to the legislator for inclusion in the *Acta*. In the existing text the "*de*" has disappeared. Was it lost in transit through the curial offices?

Without the *de* one is obliged to understand *praescripsimus* in the figurative sense of "we have prescribed". But this produces two difficulties: 1. it is the wrong word to use; 2. it is in the wrong tense.

1. Concerning the wrong word. Imperial Rome was not short of words meaning "to command or to order". The Bull *Quo Primum* in a similar passage has: "*hac nostra perpetuo valitura constitutione statuimus et ordinamus*". If the author of the insertion disliked them, he could always use "*praecipimus et mandamus*" — but *praescrpsimus* no, not in this sort of context.

2. Concerning the wrong tense. Up to this point the legislator has in fact "prescribed" nothing at all. It is precisely in this clause that he claims to do so. The verb, consequently, should be in the present tense, "*praescribimus*", "what We are ordering by this Our Constitutio"; not in the perfect, "what we prescribed". The only explanation I can think of for this howler (always presuming the *de* never to have existed) is recognition by the author that he is tampering with a pre-existing text. Moreover, the logical conclusion from the use of the wrong tense can scarcely be what its author intended: since nothing was prescribed, nothing is prescribed; and the legislator, to boot, is prescribing nothing.

Praescrpsimus: the wrong word in the wrong tense. And it is on this word that Latin Catholics are to be deprived forever of the Immemorial Mass.

OFF-PRINTS

of this article, "The Issue of Downham Market" are available at the following rates, post free:

Single copies	10p or US 30 cents.
6 copies	40p or US \$1.200
12 copies	70p or US \$2.10
50 copies	£2.50 or US \$7.50
100 copies	£4.50 or US \$13.50
500 copies	£22.50 or US \$67.50

All orders to Christian Order, 65, Belgrave Road, London, SW1V 2BG, U.K.

Father Philip Caraman, S.J. needs no introduction to readers of *Christian Order*. Each month through 1976 we hope to publish from his pen a short sketch of those before us in this country who went forward so bravely in the Faith.

FORBEARS IN THE FAITH

1: The Story of Margaret Giggs

PHILIP CARAMAN, S.J.

THE story is told in the *Life of Mother Margaret Clement*, the Prioress of St. Monica's Convent in Louvain for 38 years. She was the youngest of Margaret Giggs's eleven children.

Margaret Giggs was the daughter of a Norfolk gentleman, who appears at the side of Margaret Roper, St. Thomas More's favourite daughter, in Holbein's famous painting of the More family. Margaret Giggs was brought up as one of More's own daughters and along with his own daughter Margaret was taught Latin and Greek, an amazing accomplishment in a woman of that day. In time, Margaret Giggs married a gentleman of More's household in Chelsea, John Clement. The Clement family remained staunch Catholics and twice went into exile in Belgium, the first time in the reign of Henry VIII, the second time after the accession of Queen Elizabeth I. Here they were free to practise the religion in which they had been brought up. As a small girl Margaret Clement, the youngest child, was educated by the Augustinian Nuns of Louvain, and it is not surprising that she later entered the Convent, which she was to rule for so many years. It is in her *Life* that the story is told of the heroism of her mother at the time Henry VIII first struck at the Church.

The Carthusian monks, along with Richard Reynolds, a monk of Syon Abbey, and More and Fisher, were the King's first victims: they all refused to comply with his demand that they should acknowledge him as Supreme Head of the Church in England.

On May 4th, 1535, the first Martyrs of the English Reformation, Reynolds and the Carthusian Priors of London, Beauvale and Axholme, were executed at Tyburn. During the next five years fifteen of the London Carthusians died, either violently on the scaffold or by slow starvation in Newgate gaol. The story of Mary Giggs's brave effort to bring relief to the monks in Newgate is told simply in the *Life* of her daughter:

"Bearing a singular devotion to that holy Order and moved with great compassion for those holy Fathers, Margaret dealt with the gaoler so that she might secretly have access to them, and withal did win him with money that he was content to let her come into the prison to them, which she did very often, attiring and disguising herself as a milk-maid, with a great pail on her head full of meat, wherewith she fed that blessed company, putting meat into their mouths, they being tied and not able to stir, nor to help themselves, which having done, she took from them their natural filth.

"This pious work she continued for divers days until at last the King, inquiring if they were not dead, and understanding to his great admiration that they were not, commanded a straiter watch to be kept over them, so that the keeper durst not let in this good woman any more, fearing it might cost him his head if it should be discovered. Nevertheless, what with her importunity and by force of money, she obtained from him that he might let her go up on to the tiles, right over the close prison where the blessed Fathers were. And so she, uncovering the ceiling or tiles over their heads, by a string let down meat in a basket, bringing it as near as she could to their mouths as they did stand chained against the posts. But they, not being able to feed themselves out of the basket, or very little, and the gaoler fearing very much that it should be perceived, in the end refused to let her come any more, and so, soon after, they languished and pined away, one after the other, with

the stink and want of food and other miseries which they there endured."

In Mechlin in Belgium where Margaret Giggs, now Margaret Clement, lived during her second exile, her house became a home for all English priests passing through the country on their way to find a ship to take them to England. We do not know the exact date of her death, but the circumstances surrounding it are told in her youngest daughter's *Life*:

"But the time had now come that God had appointed to reward her for her good works done to the Fathers of the Charterhouse. He visited her with an ague which held her nine or ten days, and having brought her very low and in danger, she received all the sacraments with great devotion, and being desirous to give her blessing to all her children who were all present except her Religious daughters and one more that remained at Bruges with her husband, she caused her to be sent for in all haste. Wednesday being now come, which was the last day before she died, and asking if her daughter were come, and being told no, but that they looked for her every hour, she made answer that she would stay no longer for her, and calling her husband she told him that the time of her departing was now come, and she might stay no longer, for there were standing about her bed the Reverend Fathers, Monks of Charterhouse, whom she had relieved in prison in England and did call upon her to come away with them, and that therefore she could stay no longer, because they did expect her, which seemed strange talk unto him. Doubting that she might speak idly by reason of her sickness, he called unto her ghostly Father, a Reverend Father of the Franciscans living in Mechlin, to examine and talk with her, to whom she constantly made answer that she was in no way beside herself, but declared that she still had the sight of the Charterhouse monks before her, standing about her bedside and inviting her to come away with them, as she had told her husband. At the which they were all astonished."

Margaret Clement died the next day and was buried in the cathedral church of St. Rumold behind the altar of the Sepulchre. Her husband John died two years later and was buried beside her.

Fifty-eight years after the "ten days that shook the world", the Soviet Union finds itself still unable to provide its people with bread in sufficient quantity. Father Crane reflects on this most damning indictment of the whole Communist economic system.

Current Comment

THE EDITOR

ONE very pronounced cause of the inflation, which has been sweeping the Western World since 1972, has not been pin-pointed for popular comment as effectively as it might have been. Reference is to the huge Soviet purchases of grain which were made, particularly from the United States, in that year. These gave a great boost to food prices and the effect has been felt everywhere throughout the Western World. It was felt also in the developing countries, particularly those of Africa contiguous with the Sahara in the south, whose people were dying from hunger brought on by months — in some cases, years — of drought.

Could Foolishness go Further

The thought is a sobering one — inflation in the Western World and famine in the Third World; this is part of the price we have had to pay for Soviet Russia's agricultural ineptitude. But not only that. The Soviet forces and those of the Warsaw Pact countries today facing and greatly outnumbering the NATO forces in Europe would not be there in such strength were it not for the fact that the capitalist West, which the Soviet Union loses no opportunity of deriding, is pouring grain subsidies into Russia to keep its economy going. At great cost to itself and its people, the West is subsidizing an enemy pledged to its destruction and to defend itself against which further great sums of money have to be raised from a citizenry pressed hard into the

ground already through near-excessive taxation. It is, when you come to think of it, exceedingly difficult to see how foolishness could go any further.

At it Again

These thoughts have been aroused by the recollection that, last summer, the Soviet Union was at it again. By the fairly early summer Russia had bought 10 million tonnes of grain from the United States and 4 million from Australia and Canada. As prospects for their own harvest grew steadily worse, the Russians began clamouring for more. It was said last August that they were looking for another 15 million tonnes of grain from the West and that Russia's East European satellites were wanting a further 5 million from the same quarter. (This, incidentally, at a time when Russian naval craft were busy unloading arms for the Marxist M P L A faction in Angola at quiet spots along that country's coast line, to quote but one of innumerable examples which illustrate so well the way in which the West, through its grain sales, is furthering, at one remove, so to say, supplies of arms from the Soviet Union to revolutionary movements and so to the extension of its own pernicious influence throughout the Third World). Thankfully, the American Government decided last August, in face of the rising Russian demand, to suspend further shipments of grain to the Soviet Union until further confirmation was in its hands concerning its own harvest prospects and, more importantly, those of the Soviet Union. The danger of an added thrutch to the inflation, which the Western World has been trying desperately — and, in our own case, none too successfully — to control, makes it essential that further sales of grain to the Soviet Union should be undertaken only with the greatest circumspection. This, quite apart from the other factors already noted above.

Not enough Bread.

Meanwhile, one stunning fact remains. It can be simply and starkly put. It merits profound reflection. After 58 years of Communism — a fair time when you come to think of it — the Soviet Union finds itself unable to provide its people with

a sufficient quantity of bread, the basic staple of their diet. The failure is elementary and fundamental: it is, quite simply, appalling. Neither is it due primarily to bad harvests. By all accounts, it is due to two things — failure to provide against bad harvests through adequate storage and an inefficiency in agricultural production, which is marked throughout the Soviet economy as a whole. Yet naive observers still talk in terms of the Soviet economic achievement. What they forget is to differentiate, as they most certainly should, between technological and economic achievement. The Russians have a good many of the former to their credit, of which their performance in space is one; and so, too, is the high performance of their fighter aircraft. But economic achievement, which consists in supplying a people with the goods it wants at prices it can pay, has not been marked in the Soviet Union. In fact, it has been a dismal failure, witnessed to by the fact that, after 58 years, the Soviet Government is unable to provide its people with bread in sufficient quantity to meet their elementary needs. To such an extent that it has to shop around the outside world making secret deals with capitalist countries it affects to despise in order to make ends meet. Admittedly, the criterion used here is a material one; but it is basic to any society. Failure to measure up to it after all these years constitutes one of the severest indictments one can make of the Soviet Union. Were this situation to prevail in any country of the Western World it would be used at once by the Lefties as an indictment of capitalism. Now that it is the case in the Soviet Union (and has been for some time), you can be quite sure that not one of these despicable individuals will use it as an indictment of Communism. They are quiet in face of it: if they do shout, it is to attribute Russia's agricultural troubles to the economic war which the "imperialists" are waging against the Soviet heartland. These stupid people will be cured only when they feel the knout across their own backs. That time may be sooner than they think.

The Failure of Soviet Collectivism

What accounts for the failure, particularly of Soviet Agriculture? Undoubtedly — and in the view of those in the West who know — the collectivist basis on which Soviet

Agriculture rests and the centralised, state planning to which it is subjected. Peasants everywhere — and understandably — run from collectivization, refusing, quite rightly, to give of their best under a system that deprives a man of the full fruit of his labour and, at the same time, subsidizes the laggards on either side of him: in consequence, therefore, the pace on a collective farm in the Soviet Union is always the pace of the slowest. And state planning, which sounds so grand (by this time, only to the simple) is comfortable only in routine, insensitive to popular demand because its living is not dependent on responding to it, particularly in the Soviet Union; without initiative, therefore, unhappy and inadequate in an emergency; unable to clear up the mess it inevitably creates, left struggling, as a rule, to extricate itself from its own vomit. For example, it was written in a Soviet economic journal early last summer that the better use of tractors — not letting them stand idle when they should be working — would give Russia's agricultural economy each year the 20 million extra tonnes of grain it was finding necessary to buy from abroad. A simple operation which, I am quite sure, would never have arisen under the type of capitalist operation against which Dom Helder Camera, for example, protests with such marked volubility: that system may have many defects, but you can take it as certain that it would not leave tractors lying around doing nothing when their use might bring profits to those concerned, to say nothing of the additional supplies of bread that would be placed at the disposal of consumers. What happened in the Soviet Union? The suggestion, apparently, was not taken up; presumably because the better use of a tractor implies a break with routine and is not, in consequence, favoured by the planners: moreover, it can come only in answer, surely, to an initiative from those working on Soviet collective farms, but this initiative is applied by Soviet peasants today not to communal production, but to the private plots which each worker on the Kolkhoz is allowed to have as a concession; as a condition, I would suggest, of his keeping quiet and remaining where he is: the last thing Soviet Authority wants today is another Peasants' Revolt; there is, therefore, this compromise and it has existed for a long time. So the whole thing drifts. As a *Times* leader (15/8/75) had it at the time of

America's suppression of grain sales to the Soviet Union last summer:

"All their (the Soviet's) administrative plans, reforms and investments seem to trickle away into the Russian soil, victims of the peasant mentality, the ineptness of bureaucrats, and the fundamental problem of subjecting the personal and unpredictable world of agriculture to a socialist planning system designed for industry — and not all that successful even there. Isolated experiments in unleashing local initiative and the profit motive have been dramatically successful in agricultural terms but disastrous politically. There lies the conflict."

The system, in other words, is a failure because of its insistence on the submission of elementary economic reality to an ideology that is totally inept in this context because utterly insensitive to the basic psychological requirements of human nature.

Mr. Benn and Nationalization

Why, then, bring it here? I was never able to understand Mr Benn's moves in the direction of nationalization and state control before the E.E.C. Referendum last summer when he was Minister for Industry in the present Labour Government. He seemed to see State take-over of industry in varied form and on a massive scale as the only answer to Britain's crisis. But why? A priori, I can see no reason why an employee of British Leyland should work better if it is nationalized. I can see plenty of reasons, on the other hand, why he should work worse. Chief of these, I would suggest, is the feeling of diminished responsibility that the seemingly more remote control of nationalization will bring or be felt to bring to himself and to other workers at every level: he will see himself as associated no more closely with the making of the final product than was formerly the case; the increased impersonality of the situation to which he is subjected will alienate him from his work and show its effects throughout in a diminished output of poor-quality product. That is what we get in the Soviet Union, not only in agriculture, but in everything else whose output is governed by economic as distinct from technological norms. I see no reason to believe

that we would get anything different here if Mr Benn were to have his way and government were to take over industry through any of several forms of appropriation at present in vogue.

Jobs for All at Any Cost

To me it is extraordinary: in face of the patent and disgraceful failure of the Soviet Economy to provide the Soviet citizen with what he needs, Anthony Wedgwood Benn advocates — or was advocating last summer — government take-over of industry here as an answer to this country's present crisis; a crisis, incidentally, which has been greatly exacerbated by the effect on industry of the threats at take-over which Mr Benn and his friends on the Extreme Left are in the habit of letting out from time to time. Again, let me say it: I find the whole thing remarkable. Surely, if this country is to work itself out of the present crisis, it must do all it can, by way of first priority, to release the individual energies of the people. Why, then, do Mr Benn and his friends propose the exact opposite, telling us by implication in the policies they propose that the best thing we can do is to bottle them up. Why does Mr Benn do this? Primarily, I think, because he and those who think like him see the problem confronting this country in a way very different from that which is common to most of us. Where Anthony Wedgwood Benn and his friends are concerned, the duty of government is to provide all with a job, irrespective of economic cost, and without significant reference to freedom; necessarily, therefore, within a closed economy. It is for this reason, at base, I believe, that they opposed Britain's entry into Europe. They wanted to close this country's economy in the interests of planned jobs for all and at any cost; and they knew that membership of the European Community would not allow them to do this. I believe I was one of very many who voted for entry into Europe precisely because we loathed and detested the very thought of the isolated, controlled and closed economy which we believed at the time and which we still believe Mr Benn and his friends have very close at heart: in the last analysis, we loathe it because we believed then as we believe now that, under such a system, totalitarianism, as bad as that which scarred Nazi Germany,

is eventually unavoidable. I am sure that Mr Benn does not want an economy controlled in the way described as a means to eventual totalitarian control of this Island: what he does not appear to see, however, is that, once embarked on the road he appears to favour, eventual totalitarian control is almost inevitable.

The Difference is over Freedom

At base, I believe, the difference between Mr. Benn and his friends and the rest of us has to be seen in terms of freedom. Freedom for them, I believe, is not found in freedom of choice expressing itself in personal initiative; but, rather, in the extent to which the individual can fit, be persuaded or made to fit — like the well-oiled part of a large machine — into a companionable working community presided over by a (hopefully) beneficent and paternalistic authority. The whole thesis rests on the twofold assumption that full employment is primary and preferable to freedom (therefore to be maintained at *all* costs) and that government knows better than the citizen what is good for him.

At this stage of the argument, it needs to be pointed out that this point of view — whether justly attributable to Mr Benn and his friends on the extreme left of the Labour Party or not — is at variance with the whole Christian and western tradition of man in society. This sees society as existing primarily and essentially to serve the needs of human dignity, never to supplant them so that it absorbs the individual into itself (in the same way that Nazi Germany did and that Soviet Russia has always done). Where the Christian and western tradition is concerned, therefore, the resolution of the present crisis is not to be seen primarily in terms of the attainment of full employment irrespective of cost; irrespective, therefore, of the claims of dignity; in other words, for its own sake alone. What the Christian tradition demands is not this, which comes from a pagan and primitive view of the individual that sees him primarily as subserving the tribe, clan, group or race and tends always to totalitarianism. The Christian and western tradition would demand, rather, that the present crisis be solved in such a way that dignity is not damaged, but enhanced in a process, which sees recovery as soundly attainable through the

release and only through the release of the responsible energies of free men and women, once more allowed to make their own lives, as is their right, through the removal of those government-imposed controls which have made a mindless proletariat of them since the war, absorbing them in the group and seeing them, however subconsciously, as at their best when fitted smoothly into a government-controlled economy presided over by beneficent planners. It was the seeming adoption of this point of view by Mr Heath and his friends after his first defeat at the hands of Joe Gormley and his miners in the early spring of 1971, that split the Tory Party. What we got after that was something I once described as "Socialism run from Surburbia"; a programme, in the last analysis, not all that different from that advocated by Mr Benn and his friends, but thought to be all right because, under the Tories, it would be controlled "by decent chaps". That's what the German Army thought when it tried to control Hitler as he came to power. In the end it gave the demented corporal on solemn oath its total and uncompromising allegiance. Let us, for Heaven's sake, be warned and let us stop monkeying with freedom. There is no substitute for it. It is government's business to do all it can to support it; not steal it away, under pretext of economic necessity, by sleight of hand.

Socialism Constricts and Kills

Socialism always constricts and always eventually kills. "Mentally", a knowledgeable friend told me not long ago, "the Russian male is dead at the age of forty". I believe him: dead because he has nothing to look forward to; dead because, not being one of the privileged, he has been fitted into a slot and left there, with opportunity stripped from him, and now, at forty, comes the knowledge that there is no possibility of a future, none at all; that life for him can be no more than a drab progress downhill always to a grave. Soviet Russia is a grey land. You have only to read Solzhenitsyn to see why it must be. And yet, for many in this country, it still appears as some sort of paradise, a land in which, in some not-too-distant future, a new dawn will break. If it does, one thing is certain, the dawn will break not because of the system, but in spite of it. It will owe nothing to

Communism — except, backhandedly, for that passionate love of freedom which will have built up over the years in the hearts of the Russian people and by way of reaction to the persistent, all-pervading demands of their red, totalitarian tyranny against which they now, at last, revolt.

Soviet Communism and Western Capitalism

We have heard far too much for the past thirty years of the supposed glories of the Soviet system; far too little of the benefits brought to the whole world by western capitalism. I do not deify the latter as the ultimate in social or economic perfection. I am perfectly aware of its abuses; but I make a distinction, as I am entitled to make a distinction, between the casual ruthlessness of capitalism, which I deplore, and the studied wickedness of Soviet Communism which I loathe and despise. There is, surely, all the difference in the world between a system which, with all its faults, at least offers opportunity to the individual, though in many cases not nearly enough, and one which does not recognise him as having any opportunity at all apart from that which it may choose to confer upon him; between a system which, despite its acts of social and economic oppression from time to time, admits freely that it exists to serve the interests of the individual human being, and one which denies that he has any interests at all apart from its own. The distinction is patent and will be accepted by any reasonable man. The trouble is that a great many men are not reasonable today — in this sense that, on a basis of minimum knowledge as to how the economy works, they allow themselves to be led primarily by their emotions. Like Hitler before them, though in another context, their patience is exhausted; at this point, instead of looking for reasons, they look for instant Utopia. And it is not merely the uneducated who indulges in this kind of pernicious dreaming. There are plenty of intellectuals who do it as well. Let me quote an example from personal experience.

Softening up the Intellectuals

A couple of years or so ago, I found myself somewhere at table, sitting next to a very distinguished priest-professor for whose intellectual ability in his own field I had and have the

highest possible regard. The conversation turned to the economic condition of the country and he said, with something of a satisfied smirk, "I see there is no inflation in China". At which, I am afraid, with rather bad manners, I banged my hand on the table and told him roughly and, again I am afraid, rudely that he did not know what he was talking about; he had no understanding of the problem. "Can you not see", I said, "that the problem is not one of simply curing inflation, but curing it in a way that is compatible with freedom? It is the easiest thing in the world to have no inflation in the regulated society of China, just as it is the easiest thing in the world to maintain full employment in the regulated society of Dartmoor. All you have to do in China or any other totalitarian country is to fix prices, introduce rationing and shoot those who run a black market, as they are shooting them in Soviet Russia today for what are known as 'economic crimes'. There is no problem here for the Chinese Government and there would be no problem for our Government, if we had the same totalitarian society as the Chinese, but we have not got such a society and we do not want it. The problem of a totalitarian government is to prevent inflation without regard to individual freedom, which means nothing to them. Ours is to prevent it without damaging individual freedom, which still, thank God, means a great deal to us".

There was silence and then, by mutual though unspoken consent, we changed the subject; I was rough and I was rude. In this case, I was also right. My table companion, learned though he was, did not see the problem. Maybe, understandably, he had never adverted to it, yet he pronounced, on this particular occasion, with satisfaction at what he appeared to think of as Communist China's remarkable achievement. Unknown to himself, in all probability, he was already half softened up; already mentally conditioned in favour of socialist forms of society because unaware, really, of what they contained; yet prepared, on the basis of his quarter-knowledge of the problem, to extend to them, at least, a form of mental approval which, under similar circumstances, he would never tolerate within his own field of learning; one of those in this country today — high very much as well as low — who think that this country's problems are ripe for didactic

pronouncement by themselves, irrespective of what qualifications any of them may have.

The "Inevitability" of Communism

The story is an old one. It will always be with us. All I would stress here is that it is particularly dangerous at the present time. Communist propaganda has been insidious over past years in creating the illusion that Soviet society is evolving into nothing more than a vigorous form of a somewhat materialistic humanitarianism, essentially of pacific intent and, more particularly, that its coming to the Western World is now more or less inevitable; hence, the best thing to do is not to resist it, which would be foolishness, but mentally to condition ourselves for its coming, seeing freedom not as the good we know it to be in itself, but relatively, as a sheltering in the shadow of the Soviet wing. This is the temptation now being put before us in a myriad ways — it is better to see freedom in these terms now, for there is no point in resisting the inevitable: we must learn, sooner than we think, to live with the Soviet Union as Finland has learnt to live with her; we might just as well start conditioning ourselves for it now.

To do that, of course, is to begin to die. We can have no part of this ugly prospect whose coming is by no means inevitable. And we can have no part of it because there is no part in it for freedom, for dignity, for all that makes it worth while to be a man. Let us be quite clear in our minds on this point. Once clear, let each one stand firm.

To Be Reviewed Shortly in *Christian Order*.

Meanwhile, very strongly recommended:

The Lost Paradise
by
Philip Caraman, S.J.

The amazing story of the Jesuit Reductions in Paraguay is published by Sidgwick & Jackson at £5.95. From all booksellers.

Unworthy Shepherd

FR. WERENFRIED VAN STRAATEN

THE Author Writes: "His Lordship Dr Jozsef Cserháti, Bishop of Pécs and secretary of the Hungarian Episcopal Conference, published an article in the periodical "Vigilia" on 4th April last, on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the "liberation" of Hungary. In his interpretation of recent Hungarian Church history, he is at pains not to come into conflict with either Budapest or Rome. That in so doing he remains silent about certain truths is, though not courageous, at least understandable. But that he distorts the truth is inadmissible and is all the worse since Bishop Cserháti — said to be the government's candidate for a successor to Cardinal Mindszenty — is having the Kathpress translation of his article diffused in Western Europe too. We are therefore compelled to comment frankly on certain of his statements." (Published with acknowledgements to "Aid to the Church in Need", the White Canons, Storrington, Sussex.)

1 The bishop maintains that at the end of the war most Catholics were so backward and reactionary that they were not openminded to the social progress brought by Communism. He adds: "As all sorts of rumours about Soviet atrocities had been spread around previously, it was a long time before the mists rose and the ground thawed out".

Mons. Cserháti here gives the impression that these atrocities belong to the realm of fantasy. This does not accord with the truth. In 1945 hundreds of thousands of Hungarian men and women were deported to Russia and most of them have never returned. Tens of thousands of women and girls were raped. Cardinal Mindszenty writes about this in his Memoires: "When Russian troops reached the village where Bishop János Mikes was staying, drunken soldiers soon tried to rape girls and women. Hearing shouts and cries, he came out of his house to help those in trouble. Suddenly, he put his hand to his left side and fell lifeless on the steps. His body was laid out in the dining room. That evening the "liberators" entered the house, fetched mass

wine from the cellar, dragged in girls and drank and danced the whole night. In Győr, Bishop Apor fell a victim to the same type of soldiery. Frightened women and girls had hidden in the air-raid shelter of his residence. The bishop tried to stop the intruders from entering, so they shot him down."

Have these and countless other atrocities, admitted even by Khrushchev, escaped the bishop's notice? Or can a man chosen by atheists to occupy Cardinal Mindszenty's throne no longer tell the truth?

2. The bishop writes with evident pride: "Since the end of the war no more than about 200 priests (excluding priest members of religious orders) have left the service of the Church".

The possible successor to Cardinal Mindszenty neglects however to add that as a result of the "liberation" about 1,000 priests of religious orders can no longer carry out their duties in Christian education and are working for the most part in other occupations. Apart from the 200 priests who have forsaken their calling, hundreds of priests, on the orders of the atheists, have been given an early retirement pension by their own ecclesiastical superiors or have been exiled to moribund parishes. These priests too have been lost for pastoral duties because they refused to be slaves of the atheists, unlike the peace-priests, to whom unfortunately Mons. Cserhádi also belongs.

3. This is how the bishop describes the Communist take-over of 1945, so abhorred by the whole nation: "Three million agricultural workers were freed from the fetters of poverty and insecurity. The death knell of feudal Hungary was tolled . . . the feudal Hungarian Church, too, ceased to exist. Like all other large land estates, the Church's property passed over to the ownership of the people".

The bishop obviously does not know that in 1945 not 3 million but only one and a half million agricultural workers were employed by large estate owners. At first 600,000 of them were given a plot of land each, but this was collectivised soon after. The most they have left now is a small garden. Moreover Bishop Cserhádi says nothing about the social activity of the Church he depicts as so feudal. Long before 1945 Ottokár Prohászka, Tihamér Tóth, Bela Bangha Varga, Kerkai and many others had initiated a social reform

that was exemplary in the context of those days and bearing good fruit.

4. The bishop writes: "Men want to be free from fear and uncertainty; to escape compulsion, (. . .) to be happy". And again: "The Socialist State is in the service of progress and the welfare of man, therefore our faithful, too, consider the inner spiritual climate in our country healthy".

This episcopal optimism is hard to reconcile with the fact that the principal means used by the Hungarian people to escape compulsion and uncertainty are suicide and alcoholism. In this field Hungary comes first among all other countries. This tragic world record does not give the impression that the desperate flock shares the opinion of its unworried shepherd.

5. Cserháti quotes without criticism the Communist slogans: "Society must be freed from the influence of religion. This includes the separation of Church and State, which in principle is accepted by the Church too". He adds: "Over the last 30 years the State has shown the Church more and more trust. The latest agreements between Church and State fill us with the hope that we may look forward to still more trust and recognition from the State".

In reality the Communist State in Hungary, although it has written the Church off, keeps it under complete control by means of the State Office for Ecclesiastical Affairs. The nomination of parish priests, the repair of church buildings and all other pastoral measures fall within the competence of this State body. Every bishop has beside him an atheist who reads his letters and prevents him from conversing freely with his priests. How can Cserháti talk of recognition, trust and separation of Church and State?

In conclusion we can only hope that the spirit of Cardinal Mindszenty will remain alive. He no longer has the possibility of contradicting Bishop Cserháti's untrue assertions. In spite of the heaviest sacrifices, he was unable to stop the decay of the Hungarian hierarchy. Perhaps his prayers now at the Throne of God will achieve more!

We print below with much pleasure a paper read last year by Father John Tracy, S.J., himself long a headmaster, to the Pro Fide Teachers Group. It deserves the closest attention.

The End of Christian Education?

JOHN TRACY, S.J.

The author gratefully acknowledges permission from the publishers EVANS / METHUEN EDUCATIONAL to quote from the Schools Council Working Paper 36 *Religious Education in Secondary Schools* and Working Paper 44 *Religious Education in Primary Schools*.

IN November 1970, I was asked to speak at an education conference held in Paisley and organised by the Scottish National Council for the Lay Apostolate. I was asked to speak on the aim and purpose of Catholic education.

Aim and Purpose of Education

Before I could get started on my paper, I had to spend some time asking what was the precise difference (if any) between "aim" and "purpose" in this context. Eventually I decided that *aim* answered the question, What are you trying to do in giving a Catholic education? and *purpose* answered the question, Why are you trying to do it? I have become more and more convinced that these are the fundamental questions which split the Catholic educational world from the non-Catholic in the field of religious education, and which, over the last ten or fifteen years, have increasingly split the Catholic educational world within itself. The widely differing answers given to these questions have far-reaching consequences. I am now certain that the basic question which must be answered by the Catholic

Church from bishops to parents and teachers is: Are we or are we not aiming to make our children practising Catholics? And by "practising Catholics" I mean Catholics who try to live according to the beliefs they profess. You may think that the answer to that question is obvious. No longer. I am afraid.

Let me get away for a moment from what some would consider to be the sectarian word "Catholic", and ask more generally: Do good Christians in this country consider that the aim of religious education is to make the children convinced Christians? If you think that the answer to that question is obviously Yes, you are quite mistaken. I grant that many good Christians do think so, but in those educational circles which influence what is done in the schools, you will be told plainly that it is not the aim of moral and religious education in this country to produce Christians. Some will tell you that religious education in state schools should not be specifically Christian; others will go further and say that no religious education should be given in schools, only moral education. Accordingly, the question is: To Christianise or not to Christianise? Don't delude yourselves that those who opt for "not to Christianise" are the exceptions. At the level of educational influence, they are the majority. You are the exception; and the sooner you realise it, the better. It is you who are out of step with modern trends.

A Scottish View

I must now give you some evidence for the statement just made. Some years ago I pointed out that the prevalent view in Scottish educational circles was that religious and moral education should be "open-ended", a word which *Chambers Twentieth Century Dictionary* defines as used of questions, debates etc. "allowing free unguided answers or expressions of opinion". I made a selection of opinions from a symposium on *Curriculum and Examinations in Religious Education*, published by Moray House College of Education in 1968. I think it is worth quoting:—

"The teacher's approach to the religious lesson must be 'open-ended' It is useless simply to preach or

domgatise about one point of view the authoritative approach must be abandoned in favour of research and speculation by the pupils themselves we should not assume that the pupils are Christians or that they are at least prepared to accept the authority of Christ or that we can learn something from His teaching those teachers are working on the wrong lines who believe it is essential to communicate to pupils that Christianity is the one true religion the gospel should be presented as one answer among many the purpose of a school is not to produce Christian citizens but pupils who leave school regarding Christianity as a live option pluralism must mean a truly open situation in which all have the right to persuade all I regard with the gravest suspicion the teacher who looks on Religious Education as a form of evangelisation".

I must emphasise that I have not been quoting from some humanist manifesto. The eight educationists who contributed to the symposium are themselves good Christians, and they have many wise things to say about religious education. For example, the writer who said "I regard with the gravest suspicion the teacher who looks on Religious Education as a form of evangelisation" is no less respected a figure than Professor William Barclay. In fairness to them I must point out that they suffer from being quoted out of context, and, more important, that they were writing with non-denominational schools in mind. At the same time, I have no doubt that they would subscribe substantially to the views outlined in the selection of quotations I have just given you.

The most recent official Scottish statement of educational aims in religion is the report issued in 1972 by the Scottish Education Department. The report is the work of a committee appointed by the Secretary of State for Scotland. Two extracts will suffice to give you the flavour of the report:—

- (1) "We are advocating in this report an understanding of religious education that precludes insistence that pupils should accept any one set of beliefs in the area of religion. The school as an institution should not be attempting to persuade pupils to become Christian believers and it could therefore be seen as

something of an anomaly if the school expects children to participate in services of Christian worship as part of its normal activities while at the same time maintaining that in the field of religious education it is not concerned to advocate Christian beliefs as the ones to be accepted".

So much for what the report thinks teachers should not do. Listen now to what the teacher should do:—

- (2) "The teacher is not there to convince pupils of specific religious beliefs (far less to make them learn them); the aim should be rather to awaken children to the basic and important questions with which religious and moral belief deals and to give them enough insight into the problems and enough knowledge of the beliefs held to allow a sensible and considered judgement. For this, the children should be exposed to a number of different attitudes and beliefs without the weight of 'authority' being ultimately thrown behind any of them".

You might easily be forgiven if you thought it inconceivable that this passage could have been written by anyone with any practical experience of the classroom and the child mind. Ironically, there is a considerable weight of educational authority being thrown behind the educational attitude and belief expressed in this report.

English View the Same

It is no use trying to comfort yourself that this is Scotland. The whole point of my coming here tonight is to invite you to examine the educational scene in England and find precisely the same approach to religious and moral education. Here is a selection of quotations from various English bodies interested in religious education:—

"It is the aim of religious education to help provide children and young people with an understanding of religious symbols and language so as to enable them to reformulate a faith for the future . . . and to give them the experience and opportunities through which they can face the claim of Christianity and make a free and

responsible decision about it for themselves (Christian Education Movement) It should be clear that the aim of religious education in county schools is to deepen understanding and insight, not to proselytize (The British Council of Churches) It is not the purpose of religious education in the county school to bring about a commitment to the Christian faith, but rather to help children to understand what the Christian faith means in the context of other beliefs sincerely held by men and women of integrity and goodwill who do not find it possible to accept a Christian commitment as the basis of their lives (The Social Morality Council) The teacher is thus seeking rather to initiate his pupils into knowledge which he encourages them to explore and appreciate, than into a system of belief which he requires them to accept. To press for acceptance of a particular faith or belief system is the duty and privilege of the Churches and other similar religious bodies. It is certainly not the task of the teacher in a county school" (The Church of England Commission on Religious Education in Schools).

Some extracts now from the Schools Council Working Paper 36, on *Religious Education in Secondary Schools*, (1971). This booklet gives a first-rate survey of modern thinking in this country on religious education, and I am greatly indebted to it. In Section II, "The Approach to Religion in Schools" we read this:—

"The 'confessional' or dogmatic approach begins with the assumption that the aim of religious education is intellectual and cultic indoctrination. It is often linked with a belief that any other kind of religious education is valueless or unworthy of the name. This has been the traditional view of the Roman Catholic Church in this country, of some Jewish and Muslim leaders, and of some Protestants" The undogmatic approach "does not seek to promote any one religious viewpoint This paper is intended to clarify that approach and explore its implications it is vitally important that teaching in the field of religion should give major attention to alternative systems of belief and practice".

The Working Paper somewhat pre-emptively calls the un-
CHRISTIAN ORDER, JANUARY, 1976

dogmatic approach the educational approach. That the word is not used loosely can be seen from the subsequent revealing statement:—

“Schools should not look for their perspective either to organized religion or to the body politic, but to the insights of disciplined scholarship. That is to say, they are neither religious nor civic, but academic institutions. So far as teaching and learning are concerned, their primary loyalty is not to a traditional organized faith nor to the views of the body politic, but to the onward-going enterprise of scholars in the various fields of disciplined investigation. This is what is meant by academic freedom: the teacher is primarily responsible to the community of scholars rather than to any other social body”.

Section III of Working Paper 36 is a resume of “Recent Writing and Research in the Field of Religious Education”. The Working Paper finds the neo-confessional approach unacceptable:—

“These attempts are usually liberal in intention, and at the secondary level their approach is often described as ‘open-ended’. However, this is an ‘open-ended’ approach to Christianity This neo-confessionalism, though undoubtedly sincere, cannot be the basis of religious education in maintained schools; it is just as open to objection from non-Christian teachers as the old confessionalism In various ways all the newer agreed syllabuses attempt to introduce greater relevance and reality into religious education with a view to making it more effective They introduce many changes of approach Yet all these syllabuses remain Christian documents written by Christians and aiming at Christian education they are all Christian documents which assume that the fundamental objective of religious education is to inculcate Christianity”.

The “implicit religion” approach of educationists like Harold Loukes, an approach which puts emphasis on the analysis of experience rather than communication of information is commended in many respects, but criticised on

the grounds that it gives too little place to what is specifically religious:

"To describe as religion any 'quest for meaning' in life, poetic insight, artistic vision etc., which involves no necessary reference to any transcendent spiritual order or being for its interpretative principle is surely doing violence to language".

The Working Paper leans more heavily to the side of the "explicit religion" approach:

"The third conception of religious education in schools also abandons the 'confessional' position, but it takes as its field of study the 'explicit' phenomena of religion, Christian and non-Christian, rather than the 'implicit' meaning of secular experience".

The principal exponent of this approach is Professor Ninian Smart, the director of the current Schools Council Project on Religious Education in Secondary Schools. Smart himself says:

"The present schizophrenia in religious education consists in the twin facts that Christian education is entrenched in our school system . . . and that the typical modern institution of higher education is secular — that is, it is neutralist in regard to religious and ideological commitment".

The Working Paper comments:

"In Smart's view the confessionalist approach to religious teaching in schools is neither justified by the Pluralistic character of our society nor educationally viable since it breeds resentment in pupils The study of religion should be governed by the same educational principles as any other subject. The aim of religious teaching in schools should not be to evangelize or to induct pupils into a predetermined religious viewpoint but to create 'certain capacities to understand and think about religion' Smart notes that parents appear to want 'some sort of induction to Christianity and traditional morals for their children'. However, such an induction need not offend against educational principles

so long as other viewpoints, religious and non-religious, are accorded equally 'open' and sympathetic treatment".

In Section IV, "Aims and Objectives", the Working Paper firmly rules out the "confessionalist" aim for maintained schools and opts for an approach which combines the "personal quest" and the "phenomenological":

"We incline to the view that religious education must include both the personal search for meaning and the objective study of the phenomena of religion. It should be both a dialogue with experience and a dialogue with living religions, so that the one can interpret and reinforce the other".

Primary Schools the Same

It is no use trying to comfort yourselves with the thought that all this is concerned with Secondary Education. If you turn to the Schools Council working Paper 44, *Religious Education in Primary Schools*, (1972), you will find the same attitudes. For example, in Section VI, "The Way Forward", we read:

"There is uncertainty in the mind of many teachers today about the aims of religious education. The dichotomy in their thinking is between the educational aim of helping children to understand religion, and the evangelistic aim of helping to make children religious. Some still cling to the latter and are unwilling to accept the former wholeheartedly as the proper aim in county schools. That latter aim is, of course, appropriate in the home and in church, synagogue, temple, or mosque, but the former is the only legitimate aim in state schools when, in this secular age, they can no longer be thought of as Christian communities".

The Working Paper quotes in support the extract from the Social Morality Council report which I have already referred to (page 2), and adds this comment:

"A few teachers reject this point of view and say bluntly that they regard it as their duty to instil Christian beliefs into the children in their charge. Other teachers, by

using religious words without explaining them, telling Bible stories uncritically, and engaging children in specifically Christian worship, are suggesting to children that they ought to adopt a particular point of view and accept one body of belief rather than another. In doing so they are acting as evangelists rather than teachers, and as missionaries rather than educators. They were appointed as teachers, and it is important that they should be faithful to their appointment and accept their role as educationists".

The loaded bias of this passage — happily not representative of Working Paper 44 as a whole — begs a number of questions. It is hardly necessary to tell a group of practising teachers that bad teaching is bad teaching no matter what the subject.

I fear I have wearied you with a surfeit of quotation. But it was important to let the various educational bodies speak for themselves. Had I presented their views in my own words, there was a danger that you would think I was giving you an alarmist personal interpretation; and I had to show you that in this country current thinking on religious education is almost universally opposed to your own way of thinking. I grant you that I have been selective in my quotations — almost as selective as the theatre bills which inform the public how a particular show has been reviewed. In fact, there are in the writings from which I took the extracts many valuable insights and observations from which Catholic education has much to learn. But on the precise issue to which I wanted to direct your attention, I think I have given you a fair picture.

Catholic Approach Unashamedly Evangelistic

Time does not allow me to enlarge on the Catholic approach to religious education in Catholic schools, nor do you need me to do so. Enough, perhaps, to say boldly that it is unashamedly evangelistic. Its aim is to educate our children to become good Catholics. That means, Catholics who really live according to their beliefs. And the purpose behind this aim? Quite simply, the eternal salvation of the children committed to our care. With this goes necessarily

preparation for a fully human Christian life while they are still on their pilgrim way. Nothing truly human is alien to the Christian mind. The following of Christ and His teaching does not subtract from human life: it adds to it. "I have come so that they may have life and have it to the full" (John 10/10). The Catholic teacher's contribution to this is, and must be, more than just a part of his job. It is part of the Catholic teacher's own life, part of our working out of our own salvation as members of Christ's Mystical Body with an apostolic function of serving our growing fellow-members who are dependent on us. The most up-to-date of the various approaches I outlined claims to answer the problem of religious education on strictly educational grounds. But education is not an end in itself. Behind religious education lies philosophy and theology. Herein lies the radical source of divergence of opinion on educational approach. The Catholic position is well stated in a recent theological work:

"The most important teacher in the Church are our mothers and fathers. Without the Christian home there would be no People. And few popes and bishops would have become priests without the teaching of their mothers. In Augustine and Monica the basic truth gets classic recognition. And in the wake of parents there follows a host of school teachers, always to some extent *in loco parentis*, and a host of priests. In other words, the teaching function of Christ is given to his whole people, to be shared diversely, indeed by all, in one role or another". (Christian Truth, John Coventry S.J.).

But far more important for understanding the non-Catholic position is the sociological aspect of the question. In practice, the main opposition to evangelising or Christianising, is the pluralism of our modern society, which is inevitably reflected in the classrooms of county schools. These schools house children from homes covering every shade of belief, Christian and non-Christian, and every shade of unbelief from humanism to Communism and atheism. Throw in at this point that no section of the community is more insistent than the Catholic that children ought to be educated in accordance with the reasonable wishes of their parents. Not to appreciate the immensity of the problem for religious education in maintained schools is

to fail to do justice to the opinions of many who think differently from ourselves.

Some final quotations on this aspect of the problem:—

“The main point is that in a multi-cultural society it is not the task of education to tell children which religious interpretation they should believe but to develop in them habits of thought which will equip them to enter with understanding and sympathy into a variety of perspectives. . . . We take the view that the ‘confessionalist’ aim, though perfectly proper within a community of faith, is not appropriate within schools serving a multi-belief society. . . . A more recent and a thought-provoking contribution to the search for a positive way forward is J. W. D. Smith’s *Religious Education in a Secular Setting* (SCM Press, 1969). In this he surveys the present situation and demonstrates the impossibility of giving genuine Christian education in a secular setting”.

The two Schools Council Working Papers from which I have taken these extracts make reference to the work of another important writer in this field, Harold Loukes:

“Religious teaching cannot hope to be the same in a secular as it is in a religious society. In the present climate of religious uncertainty and thinking, the authoritative transmission of a received tradition must give way to the open search for living truth; the hope of making children Christians must yield to a hope of opening young eyes to look for themselves.

Catholics Must Stand Alone

It would be a mistake, in my opinion, for Catholics to rely on the support of other voluntary schools to maintain their present status. The School Committee of the General Board of Education of the Church of England set up its own working party to prepare a commentary on Working Paper 36. The commentary was published for the Board of Education and the National Society for Promoting Religious Education. The commentary thinks (wrongly, in my opinion) that Working Paper 36 “lays disproportionate stress on multi-racial

problems in religious education". Nevertheless, it "accepts the broad argument of Working Paper 36 — that the purpose of R.E. is not to evangelise, let alone impose, the notion of imposition being inimical to education. The 'neo-confessional' approach, therefore, is rejected".

A final question: why did I choose this topic for tonight's address? For three reasons. First, to demonstrate that it is more necessary than ever to keep our Catholic schools, and to make the plea that Catholics who think otherwise should inform themselves of the alternatives. Second, to raise the question of the quality of religious education at present being received by Catholic children in non-Catholic schools. And third, to counsel against accepting uncritically the views of distinguished educationists on religious education without examining the presuppositions and values on which those views are based. How far this has been done in some of our Catholic Colleges of Education, you yourselves know better than I.

PRAYER FOR THE BISHOPS

(by St Peter Canisius)

Almighty and eternal God, for the governing of your Holy Church and for the unity of the faith, you have placed over us the bishops as successors of the Apostles, and as guardians and protectors of souls. Pour out upon them, we beseech you, the fullness of your grace, enabling them to be good shepherds and to work fruitfully to your glory and our salvation. That by word, and above all example, they may perfectly fulfil all duties laid upon them. That they may preserve the Christian faith free from all error. That under their beneficent government we may ever live in piety, peace and Christian love. Amen.

The first of these two articles examined the causes of inflation. One cause of inflation is excessive demands for wage increases. This article examines a possible relationship between wage demands and the expansion of the public sector, before looking at the measures needed to curb the present inflation.

Inflation: The Fundamental Causes (2)

J. M. JACKSON

INFLATION may be caused by excessive demand for goods and services or by autonomous increases in costs. We saw in the previous article that if business men wanted to spend more on investment in new factories and machinery than people were willing to save when there was full employment, the total demand for goods and services would exceed the productive capacity of the country. There would be an increase in prices as a result of the excess demand rather than an increase in the physical level of output. Allowing for the complications introduced by foreign trade and the role of government, we find that there will be a tendency for prices to rise whenever the total demand for goods and services exceeds the capacity of the economy to produce, that is when the sum of expenditures on consumption plus investment plus government services plus exports minus imports exceeds the output possible at full employment.*

* Note that exports are produced with our resources and therefore reduce the supply of goods available within the country to satisfy the various demands. Imports, on the other hand, are available to meet home demand, though an excess of imports over exports may create other problems.

The other basic cause of inflation is an initial and independent rise in costs. There are two obvious examples of such cost increases in recent years. There is the big increase which took place some time ago in oil prices. We had to pay more for imported oil. Firms using the oil had to put up prices to cover the extra costs they incurred. The other example of cost inflation is excessive wage increases. When trade unions demand wage increases which are not matched by greater productivity, costs rise and firms have to put up prices.

Why Excessive Wage Demands?

Wages and prices have been rising steadily since the end of World War II. The rate of increase in recent years has greatly accelerated. Where unions might have made pay demands of 8 to 10 per cent, and perhaps been ready to settle for 5 or 6 per cent, claims were being submitted of anything up to 50 per cent or even more. It is quite impossible for demands of that order to be met without substantial increases in price. What we need to try and establish is why claims of such magnitude are being made.

Excessive wage demands may be a reflection of what workers in certain industries think they ought to be paid for the jobs they are doing. There may well be cases where particular groups have been grossly underpaid for long periods and where increases of 30 to 50 per cent are genuinely needed to bring them into line with others doing work of a comparable level. We are concerned here with the tendency for such very large claims to become general rather than confined to a few special cases. The very high level of demands that were being made until the £6 limit was enforced may reflect a genuine feeling on the part of many workers that their standard of living was too low and ought to be raised.

There must clearly be limits to any increase in living standards. These limits are set by the productivity of the economy and, temporarily, by the country's ability to import more than it exports. If workers think they should enjoy a higher standard of living, they are going to be disappointed unless it is possible to squeeze some other type of income

receiver or to increase productivity. We must remember, however, that wages and salaries take about three-quarters of the national product. An increase of a third in wages would mean that wages would come to absorb the whole of the national product. Productivity increases are more likely to be around 2 per cent a year rather than 5 per cent. So the scope for wage increases is strictly limited. Are we, then, simply in a situation where wage demands are totally unrealistic, where workers are simply asking for the impossible and unwilling to face the economic facts of life.

It is quite possible that in part the pressure for higher wages comes from unrealistic expectations on the part of many workers; they may not appreciate that a sharp rise in the cost of living following the staggering increase that took place in oil prices after the last Middle East war was an indication that we were going to have to part with more of our domestic output in exchange for essential fuel imports and that in consequence our standard of living would have to fall. There may also be those who are only too happy to exploit any difficult situation for their own ends.

There is, however, another possibility that must be considered. The ordinary person may feel his standard of living is being squeezed unreasonably. Not only is he being faced with rising prices for most of the goods he buys but he is also being subjected to increased tax demands; local rate demands in particular seem to escalate astronomically. There may be some inefficiency in public spending, but this is probably of minor importance. What really matters is that there has been a tendency for government spending to increase; for the scale of provision of government services to increase.

Do we want Government Services?

It is easy to argue that the government is spending too big a part of the community's income and that individuals would prefer to have more of their incomes left to spend as they choose. It is more difficult, however, to say exactly what cuts should be made. As soon as particular cuts are suggested, somebody always has an argument in favour of maintaining or even increasing the present scale of activity. 'Government

spending' is too much, but people complain if they do not get the service they would like when ill or if they feel the schools are not giving their children the education they should have.

The trouble may be that we are faced with a paradox. In total, government expenditure is too great, even if the level of expenditure on particular services is not excessive. The trouble may arise from the fact that certain services have been taken over by the government. Services like the provision of education and medical care are taken over by the government and are 'free'. 'Free', of course, only in the sense that no charge is made to the user of the service, the costs being met by the taxpayer.

Because these services are provided in this particular way, there is a danger that the ordinary person ceases to be aware of the cost. He looks forward to a certain standard of provision being made, but is never presented with a proper bill. He is faced with a massively increased tax demand, but not confronted with the price of the particular service he needs. Is it possible that if medical care had been provided for the last 27 years under a system where the individual paid at least an insurance premium that would cover him for the cost of treatment when ill (with appropriate assistance to meet the cost of such insurance for the poor), that the situation today might be very different. People might be willing to sacrifice consumption of many kinds knowing that this was necessary in order to pay for something they wanted — like insurance to cover the cost of medical care. They may feel less willing to make similar sacrifices to have the service provided 'free' by the government. The result is that with many essential services provided by the government, the individual feels he wants a high level of personal consumption and to have the government services without an apparently excessive level of taxation. If he thinks the level of taxation is squeezing his personal consumption too much he tries to offset it by pressing for higher wages.

The position may be worsened in several ways. A large part of the cost of education is met from the rates. The rates are the worst form of tax we have in this country. The tax paid is related to the value of property occupied. The same tax is paid by two families occupying similar houses, even though in one case there are several young children and the mother is at home looking after them whilst the other may

have two or even more wage earners and no dependent children.

Short-term Remedies

In so far as inflation may be caused by excessive wage demands, it follows that inflation cannot be curbed unless wage increases are brought under control. Moreover, bringing wages under control is not enough in itself. If a government were to agree that as a condition of wage restraint, it would use subsidies to limit the increase in the cost of living, it could be creating serious problems. The situation may be that the standard of living ought to fall, indeed has to fall. If subsidies are cushioning the fall in the cost of living, the reduction in inflationary pressure may not be achieved. If some people need to be protected against the cost of living rising too rapidly, they should be given direct financial aid. It costs less to give money to those in genuine need than to subsidise the cost of living for all.

The £6 a week limit on wage and salary increases helps to restrain the pressure on labour costs at the present time. It also gives relatively greater increases to the lower paid. It is not, however, a policy that can be maintained for more than a relatively brief period. In itself, it distorts relativities between jobs, and further distortions have been created between those who had big increases shortly before the £6 limit was imposed and those who were caught by the new policy. There is a good case for maintaining a policy that gives proportionately more to the lower paid, but not at the cost of failing to rectify anomalies at the top of the pay scale. It may be necessary to impose for another year at least severe restrictions at the higher ends of the pay scale for those who are relatively well paid for the level of work they are doing. This is necessary if it is to be possible both to give relatively generous treatment to the poorly paid (that is those on really low pay) and also to raise the pay of those who though not badly paid in any absolute sense are underpaid for the work they are doing.

There must clearly be restraint in government spending. There has been, in the past, some tendency to assume that the services provided by the government must continue to be improved and widened. There are certainly many things now

done by the government which could, with advantage be expanded or improved if the resources were available. There is a difference between what is desirable and what should be done at the present time. The basic economic problem is choosing between desirable ends because our resources are limited.

Long-term Measures

There are signs that the public has now recognised the existence of an economic crisis. In a crisis situation, there is the possibility that restraint will be accepted on a scale that will not be accepted when conditions appear normal. It may also be difficult for such restraint to be accepted over any long period. There is a need, therefore, to consider what long term measures should be taken to prevent a recurrence of the inflationary pressures of the last couple of years.

It may be necessary for government expenditure to continue to be subject to a strict scrutiny. Whilst this must be true of all government expenditure, it would be particularly helpful if there could be a move away from the present government provision of services towards one in which people paid for the services they needed and were made aware of the costs. We need to create a system where people freely choose to spend on services like health and education rather than have them provided 'free', so that they will not expect to have these services provided but try to avoid the necessity for paying. This, however, may be a very long term solution. One cannot see such a policy being operated in the near future. And one can certainly not call for big cuts in spending on health and education. It is far from certain that the current spending on these services is in excess of what people might choose to spend in a totally different context.

In the first article, it was made clear that inflationary pressures would be created if investment were too high in relation to people's willingness to save. The question must be asked, therefore, whether it might be necessary to limit investment, or at least to stop trying to encourage investment. A choice has to be made between spending on investment and spending on other things. All forms of expenditure, private consumption, investment, government

spending are all competing for the community's scarce resources. It is quite possible to argue therefore that investment is too high. If investment were reduced, it would release resources to increase the production of the consumer goods people want. There is no particular reason why we should argue that it is government spending rather than investment which is taking money out of consumers' pockets and preventing them enjoying the living standard they want.

- It may be asked how can business men carry out investment if people do not want to save and lend them their savings. The answer is that investment can be financed with money borrowed from the banks; nationalised industries may have capital provided by the government, which may come from tax revenues or from borrowing. The use of real resources to produce investment goods reduces the supply of resources to meet other needs and may create dissatisfaction among the ordinary citizens.

It may, however, be necessary to maintain a high level of investment. British industries must remain competitive with their foreign rivals. Nevertheless, unnecessary investment should be avoided. This means that everything should be done to increase output and improve efficiency without additional investment. Unnecessary restrictions on the use of existing machinery should be removed.

Whatever measures are taken, it seems probable that for some years to come workers in this country will have to accept that their living standards will have to remain static or at the best rise slowly. There is unlikely to be a return to the rapid increase in living standards which has occurred in recent years.

The Catholic Centre

for

Creation Research

devotes itself to the propagation of Direct Creation Theory at a time when a flood of writing, some of it Catholic, insists on telling us that we must all be Evolutionists now. Its Newsletter is highly recommended and is obtainable at a subscription of £2 or \$5.00 from:

Miss Paula Haigh,
1122 Garvin Place 113,
Louisville,
Kentucky 40203,
U.S.A.

Book Review

MIRACLES AND THE MODERNIST

The Miracle of Jesus: What Really Happened? by H. J. Richards; Fontana, 1975, 50p; pp. 128.

Fr. Hubert Richard's latest book has on its title page, in addition to its compound title, the sub-title "An Introduction to the Theology of John". Examination shows that sure enough it has three constituent elements: a meditation on the theological significance of John's miracle stories; a philosophical-theology of miracles; and an attempt to see what is left of the miracles as events when the two former elements are combined. In the course of the work, light is cast on Fr. Richard's views on such important matters as the Resurrection, the Incarnation and the Trinity; and while these are not dealt with systematically, they are of considerable significance given their widespread propagation in New Catechetical circles.

Fr. Richard's "meditation on the miracle stories" of John (page 29), which forms the bulk of chapters three to nine, is excellent. He carefully and convincingly discloses the significance of John's seven miracle stories or signs (plus the post-resurrection miraculous draught of fishes) as figures of Christ's death and resurrection, and his grace-giving dealings with the Church, especially through the sacraments.

Some of the elements in John's symbolism will be familiar to most readers, but few would find no further enlightenment and profit from reading these chapters — or rather the major portions of them — of Fr. Richards' book. Unfortunately, however, this admirable elucidation of the significance of the Johannine miraculous signs is subordinated to a direct assault on the traditional (not "nineteenth century", cf. page 11) doctrine of miracles, elaborated in chapters one, two and ten of *The Miracles of Jesus*, but operative throughout.

Fr. Richards' book exemplifies to the letter Pope St. Pius X's words in *Pascendi* about the writings of the Modernists: "Thus in their books one finds some things which might well be approved by a Catholic, but on turning over the page one is confronted by other things which might well have been dictated by a rationalist".

In the Foreword (page 10) we are told that "theologians" in recent years have been giving considerable attention to what "unprejudiced scholarship" has established about the miracle stories. In fact, it is manifest that Fr. Richards and theologians with his approach are far from unprejudiced. Rather, they approach the gospels with a philosophical theology which determines a priori the limits of what may be taken literally and what must be understood as exaggerations or devised concrete symbols of religious truth. This philosophical-theology Fr. Richards expounds in his second chapter, "What Really Happened?", principally in the sections headed: "A New Understanding of the World", "Miracles in a Secular World" and "Taking the Incarnation Seriously".

In the section, "Taking the Incarnation Seriously", we are shown two traditional and incompatible models of "nature", the closed nature of the materialist, and the nature occasionally open to supernatural intervention of the traditional Christian (page 22). Fr. Richards dismisses both the materialist view and the traditional Christian one as "dismal world pictures" (shades of *Honest to God*), and seeks to persuade us that "Christianity" is the good news that "the heavenly . . . is from now on, for ever, to be found in the earthly, and only there. Jesus has demythologised the 'supernatural'".

The considerations which lead Fr. Richards to discard the concept of the supernatural — the transcendent God — in favour of a "God" within nature (existentialist theologian John Macquarries's "being of all things", perhaps?), are set out in an earlier section, "A New Understanding of the World". These are: that the traditional supernatural is what is invoked as the explanation of such natural phenomena as have not been scientifically explained; such unexplained natural phenomena — gaps — are rapidly being reduced in number; and modern man believes that all these will be

scientifically explained in due course, leaving no more gaps and rendering the supernatural redundant.

While it is true that in certain cultures various natural phenomena have been explained — attributed to — the actions of intelligent, non-natural beings, gods, fairies, etc., it is manifestly not true as a matter of the history of ideas that Catholic theologians have postulated a "God of the gaps". Whatever be the strengths and weaknesses of their philosophising, Catholic theologians throughout the ages have argued to the existence of the Creator from quite general features of nature, such as design and causality. That is, they have not argued to God's existence from certain scientifically unexplained kinds of events; but rather from general and constant features of experience and from the categories in which these are scientifically explained. Catholic theologians have conceived the supernatural, in the sense in which we are currently interested, as the ultimate explanation of the natural and naturally explainable.

Modern writers on the history of scientific thought have advanced the view that the Christian theological model of the universe as an intelligible, unitary system, accounts for why the scientific revolution occurred in the West and not, for instance, in China. Traditional Christian theology's rejection of the pagan "gaps" inspired the confident search for natural laws. Equally, a contemporary philosopher, such as Prof. Ninian Smart, finds no logical incompatibility between the concepts of scientific laws and miracles. Fr. Richards' rejection of the miraculous rests solely on the view that the concept of the traditional transcendent God is unnecessary and unacceptable.

For his view that the transcendent God is unnecessary, Fr. Richards has done no more than set up a philosophical man of straw — bearing no resemblance to the God of traditional Christian theology — to have the satisfaction of knocking it down like an Aunt Sally. He gives no philosophical reason for finding the supernatural unacceptable — "the mood of modern man" (page 14) is not a philosophical reason — let alone for accepting a religiously significant "within" of nature to which we should transfer the name "God". Fr. Richards is a competent biblical exegete, but manifestly he has not the slightest philosophical

competence. Yet neither have the bulk of his potential readership in New Catechetical circles. They are educated enough to read and make their own the first stirrings of philosophical-theological questioning; they are unequipped to begin answering those questions, and so will almost inevitably end up as muddled as their mentor — no longer believing in the Christian transcendent God, but ascribing his name and some of his attributes to the superstitious object of a nature-mysticism.

This brief philosophical excursion has been necessary to grasp the essence of Fr. Richards' Modernism. It has enabled us to understand and evaluate his rejection of the miraculous, and it prepares us for his answer (such as it is) to the question of what really happened, and to examine the reductionist use he makes of John's theology.

In the section "Did Jesus Work Miracles?" in chapter ten "Explaining the Miracles Away?", Fr. Richards makes clear that he envisages Jesus as a faith-healer who had a reputation for performing "wonders", and that these formed the factual basis for the exaggerations which were put to good purpose by the evangelists in their theological narratives, as symbols of the death and resurrection of Jesus, and their meaning for the Christian believer.

We have acknowledged Fr. Richards' skilful exposition of the theology of John's seven miraculous signs prior to the narrative of Our Lord's death and resurrection — their signifying and explaining that death and resurrection. We have also seen that he rejects the miraculous *a priori* because of his philosophical-theological repudiation of the transcendent Creator. Because of his repudiation of miracles Fr. Richards wishes to conclude that whatever the basis of John's seven stories of miracles or signs, they are not accounts of real miracles. Rather does he hold that the reality signified by the miracle — the crucified and risen Christ — is their only important reality.

He tells us (pages 102 and 103) that he has "deliberately gone to the gospel of John to analyse the miracles (because) he makes explicit the theology which (he) is convinced is present in the miracle stories of all four gospels". That is, Fr. Richards holds that the historical nature of the synoptic miracle stories is likewise irrelevant to their religious truth.

However, such plausibility as this thesis has in the case of John's gospel is conspicuously lacking in the cases of Matthew, Mark and Luke. This is not just because their theology "lies too deep beneath the surface" — exegetes have already analysed much of their theology — but because the historical reality of Christ's miracles is central to, for instance, Mark's theological thesis that Jesus Christ is indeed the Son of God. In Mark the miracles, nature miracles as well as miraculous cures (significant though they are perceived to be for the Christian life, e.g. restoration of sight as a sign of the enlightenment brought by faith in Christ), do not so much symbolise the resurrection as prepare for it as the climax of Christ's "intervention".

Reflection on Fr. Richards' theologising makes it clear that his Modernism has made of him a New Gnostic, revealing the true meaning of the gospels and the real nature of Christianity after almost two thousand years of misunderstanding and superstition by the Catholic Church (and equal ignorance on the part of the other historical Christian bodies).

In chapter ten, "Explaining the Miracles Away?" Fr. Richards tells us frankly: "He has declared his hand by saying that all the miracle stories do not have to be 'miraculous' in the old sense. He has given judgment that it is possible to believe in Jesus and in the resurrection without the 'miraculous' " (page 105). That Fr. Richards' view of the resurrection does not involve a miracle is, of course, entailed by what he has expounded about his philosophical-theological presuppositions; but we may be grateful to him for stating this fact so that no muddled bishop may convince himself otherwise.

While we will have to wait for what will surely prove to be the next volume in Fr. Richards' What Really Happened Series (*The Miracles of Jesus: What Really Happened?* was preceded in 1973 by *The First Christmas: What Really Happened?*) for him to tie up certain loose ends in this book about his view of the "resurrection", certain matters of capital importance are already clear. The first of these is that the former Principal of Corpus Christi College, London, (Cardinal Heenan's cathetical institute) does not believe that Our Lord's resurrection involves his physical body coming

back to life, because that would be a miracle and he rejects the miraculous.

At many points in his book Fr. Richards affirms his belief in Jesus' "resurrection" — which he finally states explicitly is not a physical miraculous matter — but he frequently speaks in such an untraditional way as to make clear that the "resurrection experience" need not (indeed probably did not) involve even any extraordinary physical event, "seeing" the Resurrected Lord in the kind of way that, for instance, St. Bernadette "saw" Our Lady at Lourdes. For example, after telling us he wishes to make a meditation on the miracle stories (page 29), Fr. Richards states: "I wish to ask, with the evangelist, 'What do these stories mean for someone who has seen the risen Christ?' as he had, and as I have". Fr. Richards has "seen" the risen Christ, and "seen" him in the same sense as the evangelist had or, for that matter, (as he tells us elsewhere) as had the community which first told the story.

The "resurrection experience — whatever it is that this consisted of and however it is to be explained" (page 26) — of the disciples is alleged to be essentially no different from the act of commitment by which present day Christians "see" the Risen Lord.

In what sense Christ "is risen" is not apparent from *The Miracles of Jesus*. What is definite is that this is not bodily, so in the literal sense of the word Christ is dead. (Normal English usage entails that this too is the natural meaning of I.C.E.L.'s acclamation, "Christ has died, Christ is risen . . ." To say what an orthodox Christian would wish to affirm, one would have to discard the symmetry provided by the auxiliary verbs and state, "Christ died, Christ has risen. . .") Likewise, whether "the actual physical event of dying loses its importance" (page 95) only because of the outlook on life of the Christian, or because after all there is some "beyond" — if only "within" nature — where human consciousness continues, is not stated. Perhaps Fr. Richards will put us out of our suspense in his next volume?

In spite of the gentleness of Fr. Richards' exposition of his Modernism — and with other New Catechetical experts — every so often, along with the amusing little stories of children's misunderstanding of their religious instruction,

come malicious, even hypocritical, stabs at traditional Catholic belief. Belief in transubstantiation is subtly insinuated to be a case of adult "magical fantasies" (page 46); the Real Presence in the tabernacle is sophically jibed at: "Christ is not in love with boxes, but with people" (page 60); pagan gods and demons, angels and fairies, are given the same ontological status (page 14).

"Without prejudging the issue, it would be dishonest not to draw attention . . ." writes Fr. Richards (page 85) as he insinuates that the raising of Lazarus is based on the parable of Dives and Lazarus. Christ's miracles are not a matter of "more powerful magic", we are told repeatedly (pages 46, 96 and 109). Christ did not literally change water into wine, like a "heavenly magician" (page 38). While that last taunting phrase may have too disparaging connotations for some, to be embraced and used against the Modernists, the present writer shares the conviction expressed by Hugo Meynell in his *The New Theology and Modern Theologians* (Sheed & Ward, 1967) that Christianity involves the "true magic which puts all other magic out of business".

We have seen that Fr. Richards' (in itself perfectly acceptable) meditation on the significance of John's miracle stories, is unfortunately presented as a substitute for accepting any real miracles in the gospels, because the former Principal of Corpus Christi College's conception of the modern world view invalidates belief in the traditional transcendent God of Christianity. He apparently substitutes for the transcendent God the object of his nature mysticism (the within of nature), and transfers to this superstitious fantasy the name and some of the attributes of God. This, he would have us believe, is the "God" which is revealed in the man Jesus.

Jesus is "divine" in that he reveals what God is like in his death. This identification of Jesus in death with "God" apparently makes his death also his resurrection, ascension and pentecost. The Spirit of Jesus — "or Holy Ghost as we have come to call him in our quaint English" (page 123) — is, in spite of the pious capital 'S', simply the spirit, attitudes or commitment to love of the man Jesus. In that sense, to share the "Spirit of Jesus" is to live like Jesus, with his outlook, commitment, etc. Consciously or unconsciously, this

caricature of the Trinity has been largely substituted for the Catholic doctrine in such masterpieces of the New Cathetics as the Primary School R.E. Syllabus of the Motherwell Diocese.

God grant that Fr. Hubert Richards may be brought back to the Catholic Faith. Until that happens, he should be deprived of his status as a "Catholic" priest in order to protect students, teachers and our school children from his virulent Modernism,

W. J. Morgan.

Editor's Note: Since these lines were written, Father Hubert Richards has publicly announced his intention of leaving the priesthood.

THE MASS at DOWNHAM MARKET Celebrated by Fr. Oswald Baker

This is a recording of a sung Tridentine Mass, made on the Feast of All Saints, 1975. The entire Mass is included on the record and the text of the sung parts, (in Latin and English), will be found inside the sleeve.

This record will not only enable the many friends of Downham Market throughout the world to associate themselves with Fr. Baker to an extent they might never have thought possible, but it will be particularly valuable in helping young Catholics who have never experienced it, to realise the beauty, the dignity, and the doctrinal richness of the Tridentine Mass — the Mass which is, as Fr. Faber wrote, "the most beautiful thing this side of heaven".

"This is clearly a record of great historical importance. It could be the last recording ever made of the traditional Mass celebrated as part of the normal life of an English parish".

MICHAEL DAVIES

Copies may be ordered by post from: COIMBRA RECORDINGS, DEPT E. Highbury Studios, Swan Yard, London N1 1SD. Price £2.60 post free (UK & Eire). Overseas: £3.10 (payable by international money order) packing and postage (by surface mail) included.

REFORMATION

1974

Yesterday's safe inside books:

the sack of the monasteries,
Luther hatching Erasmus's egg,
and Henry's lust.

Matter for laughter: the randy monarch,
jolly round friars, the Diet,
ill-named for irreverent scholars, of Worms.

Yesterday's, safe inside books.

Why bother today?

those arthritic monks
are remote. How picture them pained and bemused
by the loss of a niche

Too cosy by far. And the old nuns sent home
to demand as they sat by the fire,
unneeded, unused, "My whole life was it wrong?"

But why bother today?

Tomorrow's books

will relate with detachment
the bloodless breach of the cloister's pale,
the sack of silence.

No book will convey the rueful compliance,
smiling, dismayed, of today's dispossessed
who once never doubted their giving was blest.

What today, what tomorrow for them?

PRO FIDE BOOK SERVICE

THE GATES OF HELL by Anne Roche. Price £2.75 (\$5.60).

The struggle for the Catholic Church.

THE ENCYCLICAL HUMANA E VITAE. Price 90p (\$2.00).
A Sign of Contradiction. By Dietrich von Hildebrand.

THE ENEMY WITHIN THE GATE by Fr. John McKee.
Price £3.90 (\$8.20).

An analysis of modernism.

THE DOUAI-RHEIMS NEW TESTAMENT + Price £2.30
FOLLOWING OF CHRIST by Thomas a Kempis. (\$4.20).
Sequel to 'The Imitation of Christ'.

SCIENTIFIC CREATIONALISM. Price £2.00 (\$4.00).
An eminent team of scientists show that evolutionist teaching is false scientifically and historically.

THE WHEAT AND THE COCKLE by Rev. P. J. Gearon.
Price £1.85 (\$3.90).

The submission of Catholics to their spiritual head springs essentially from a refusal to compromise principles they regard as sacred with an ever-changing world.

All prices include postage.

Write for Full Book List to *The Pro Fide Book Service*, 39
Blenheim Park Road, South Croydon, Surrey.

Readers: Please Note

This Month, January:

Father Philip Caraman, S.J., Author of "The Lost Paradise", which tells the story of the Paraguay Reductions and which has come in for very high praise from reviewers, begins a new monthly series for *Christian Order*, which is by way of a follow-up to a previous series, which we had the privilege of publishing in *Christian Order* and which was entitled, "Elizabethan Catholics and the Mass". This series was received by readers with gratitude. Father Caraman's current series, which begins this month and which is entitled, "Forbears in the Faith" will come in, we believe, for a like reception.

Next Month, February:

Father Robert Nash, S.J., Ireland's best known priest-journalist and spiritual writer, begins in *Christian Order* a three-part article entitled, "To Whom Shall We Go?". Intended mainly for priests and religious, it will be of help, we believe, to all during this time of deep trouble in the Church.

Again, in February:

We shall be publishing what may well prove to be the most significant article we have ever put in print in *Christian Order* (and that is saying something!). "The New Christianity: a Snare and a Delusion" first appeared in the *Civiltà Cattolica* and has since been given wide currency in a variety of languages. It gives the clearest possible picture of the crisis at present afflicting the Church. We consider this article of *inestimable* value. It deserves the widest possible circulation throughout the English-speaking world. No reader could do better than take out a subscription right away for a friend. It is worth while doing so in order that he or she may read this article alone.

With Best New Year Wishes,
Paul Crane, S.J.